

**Exhibit 6**

Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP  
One Market, Spear Street Tower  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
Tel: 415.442.1000  
Fax: 415.442.1001  
[www.morganlewis.com](http://www.morganlewis.com)

**Morgan Lewis**  
COUNSELORS AT LAW

John H. Hemann  
Partner  
415.442.1355  
[jhemann@morganlewis.com](mailto:jhemann@morganlewis.com)

October 12, 2006

**PRIVILEGED & CONFIDENTIAL**

**VIA HAND DELIVERY**

Marc J. Fagel, Esq.  
United States Securities and Exchange Commission  
Division of Enforcement  
44 Montgomery Street, Suite 2600  
San Francisco, CA 94104

Re: In the Matter of KLA-Tencor Corporation

Dear Mr. Fagel:

KLA-Tencor Corporation (the "Company"), through a Special Committee authorized by the Board of Directors, commenced a review of the company's stock options granting practices on or about May 24, 2006. In the course of its investigation, the Special Committee collected confidential corporate records and communications, including records and communications that may be protected by the attorney-client privilege and work product doctrine. In light of the interest of the Staff of the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (the "Staff") in determining whether there have been any violations of the federal securities laws, and the Company's common interest in investigating and analyzing the circumstances and people involved in the events at issue, KLA-Tencor and the Special Committee will voluntarily provide to the Staff copies of documents that may be protected by the attorney-client privilege and work product doctrine ("Confidential Materials").

Please be advised that by producing the Confidential Materials pursuant to this agreement, KLA-Tencor and the Special Committee do not intend to waive the protection of the attorney work product doctrine, attorney-client privilege, or any other privilege applicable as to third parties. The Company believes that the Confidential Materials warrant protection from disclosure.

Mark J. Fagel, Esq.  
October 12, 2006  
Page 2

**Morgan Lewis**  
COUNSELORS AT LAW

The Staff will maintain the confidentiality of the Confidential Materials pursuant to this agreement and will not disclose them to any third party, except to the extent that the Staff determines that disclosure is otherwise required by law or would be in furtherance of the Commission's discharge of its duties and responsibilities.

The Staff will not assert that the production of the Confidential Materials to the Commission constitutes a waiver of the protection of the attorney work product doctrine, the attorney-client privilege, or any other privilege applicable as to any third party. The Staff agrees that production of the Confidential Materials provides the Staff with no additional grounds to subpoena testimony, documents or other privileged materials from the Company or the Special Committee, although any such grounds that may exist apart from such production shall remain unaffected by this agreement.

The Staff's agreement to the terms of this letter is signified by your signature on the line provided below.


Sincerely,



John Hemann

AGREED AND ACCEPTED:  
United States Securities and Exchange Commission

By:

  
Division of Enforcement  
Mark J. Fagel

**Exhibit 7**



	Page 2	Page 4
1		A P P E A R A N C E S (Continued)
2		
3	For KLA-Tencor Corporation:	
4		
5	JOHN H. HEMANN, ESQ.	
6	TERA M. HEINTZ, ESQ.	
7	MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP	
8	One Market, Spear Street Tower	
9	San Francisco, California 94105	
10	Phone: 415.442.1000	
11	Fax: 415.442.1001	
12	jhemann@morganlewis.com	
13	theintz@morganlewis.com	
14		
15	For the Deponent:	
16		
17	MARK A. BELNICK, ESQ.	
18	LAW OFFICES OF MARK A. BELNICK, LLC	
19	120 West 45th Street, Suite 1700B	
20	New York, New York 10036	
21	Phone: 646.453.2900	
22	Fax: 646.453.2908	
23	mbelnick@belnicklaw.com	
24		
25	Also Present:	
26	Margaret Austin, Paralegal	
27	Gary Brewer, Videographer	
28		
29		
30		
31		
32		
33		
34		
35		
36		
37		
38		
39		
40		
41		
42		
43		
44		
45		
46		
47		
48		
49		
50		
51		
52		
53		
54		
55		
56		
57		
58		
59		
60		
61		
62		
63		
64		
65		
66		
67		
68		
69		
70		
71		
72		
73		
74		
75		
76		
77		
78		
79		
80		
81		
82		
83		
84		
85		
86		
87		
88		
89		
90		
91		
92		
93		
94		
95		
96		
97		
98		
99		
100		
101		
102		
103		
104		
105		
106		
107		
108		
109		
110		
111		
112		
113		
114		
115		
116		
117		
118		
119		
120		
121		
122		
123		
124		
125		
126		
127		
128		
129		
130		
131		
132		
133		
134		
135		
136		
137		
138		
139		
140		
141		
142		
143		
144		
145		
146		
147		
148		
149		
150		
151		
152		
153		
154		
155		
156		
157		
158		
159		
160		
161		
162		
163		
164		
165		
166		
167		
168		
169		
170		
171		
172		
173		
174		
175		
176		
177		
178		
179		
180		
181		
182		
183		
184		
185		
186		
187		
188		
189		
190		
191		
192		
193		
194		
195		
196		
197		
198		
199		
200		
201		
202		
203		
204		
205		
206		
207		
208		
209		
210		
211		
212		
213		
214		
215		
216		
217		
218		
219		
220		
221		
222		
223		
224		
225		
226		
227		
228		
229		
230		
231		
232		
233		
234		
235		
236		
237		
238		
239		
240		
241		
242		
243		
244		
245		
246		
247		
248		
249		
250		
251		
252		
253		
254		
255		
256		
257		
258		
259		
260		
261		
262		
263		
264		
265		
266		
267		
268		
269		
270		
271		
272		
273		
274		
275		
276		
277		
278		
279		
280		
281		
282		
283		
284		
285		
286		
287		
288		
289		
290		
291		
292		
293		
294		
295		
296		
297		
298		
299		
300		
301		
302		
303		
304		
305		
306		
307		
308		
309		
310		
311		
312		
313		
314		
315		
316		
317		
318		
319		
320		
321		
322		
323		
324		
325		
326		
327		
328		
329		
330		
331		
332		
333		
334		
335		
336		
337		
338		
339		
340		
341		
342		
343		
344		
345		
346		
347		
348		
349		
350		
351		
352		
353		
354		
355		
356		
357		
358		
359		
360		
361		
362		
363		
364		
365		
366		
367		
368		
369		
370		
371		
372		
373		
374		
375		
376		
377		
378		
379		
380		
381		
382		
383		
384		
385		
386		
387		
388		
389		
390		
391		
392		
393		
394		
395		
396		
397		
398		
399		
400		
401		
402		
403		
404		
405		
406		
407		
408		
409		
410		
411		
412		
413		
414		
415		
416		
417		
418		
419		
420		
421		
422		
423		
424		
425		
426		
427		
428		
429		
430		
431		
432		
433		
434		
435		
436		
437		
438		
439		
440		
441		
442		
443		
444		
445		
446		
447		
448		
449		
450		
451		
452		
453		
454		
455		
456		
457		
458		
459		
460		
461		
462		
463		
464		
465		
466		
467		
468		
469		
470		
471		
472		
473		
474		
475		
476		
477		
478		
479		
480		
481		
482		
483		
484		
485		
486		
487		
488		
489		
490		
491		
492		
493		
494		
495		
496		
497		
498		
499		
500		
501		
502		
503		
504		
505		
506		
507		
508		
509		
510		
511		
512		
513		
514		
515		
516		
517		
518		
519		
520		
521		
522		
523		
524		
525		
526		
527		
528		
529		
530		
531		
532		
533		
534		
535		
536		
537		
538		
539		
540		
541		
542		
543		
544		
545		
546		
547		
548		
549		
550		
551		
552		
553		
554		
555		
556		
557		
558		
559		
560		
561		
562		
563		
564		
565		
566		
567		
568		
569		
570		
571		
572		
573		
574		
575		
576		
577		
578		
579		
580		
581		
582		
583		
584		
585		
586		
587		
588		
589		
590		
591		
592</td		

Nichols, Stuart J. Esq.

1/27/2008

Page 6			Page 8		
1        I N D E X (Continued)			1        I N D E X (Continued)		
2        EXHIBITS			2        EXHIBITS		
3        No.	Description	Page	3        No.	Description	Page
4        Exhibit 51 Letter dated 10/18/99 to Stuart 5        Nichols; Nos. MLB/KLA-SEC00016923 6        through 16924	65		4        Exhibit 72 Email with attachment from Stuart 5        Nichols dated 3/14/01; Nos. 6        KT ACWP-PRIV00001905 through 1909	198	
7        Exhibit 52 Letter dated 10/7/99 to Stuart 8        Nichols; Nos. MK0003340-341	65		7        Exhibit 73 Email with attachment from Roger 8        Stern dated 3/14/01; Nos. 9        KT ACWP-PRIV00002365 through 2370	198	
9        Exhibit 53 New Hire Form; No. MLB/KLA-SEC00016905	65		10      Exhibit 74 Email thread with attachment from 11      Bret DiMarco dated 3/14/01; Nos. 12      KT ACWP-PRIV00001328 through 2381	198	
10      Exhibit 54 Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of 11      Directors of KLA-Tencor Corporation 12      November 16, 1999; Nos. KLS-SEC002735 13      through 2739	81		11      Exhibit 75 Email thread from Bret DiMarco dated 12      3/14/01; Nos. KT ACWP-PRIV00001327 13      through 2370	198	
14      Exhibit 55 Memo dated 1/5/00 from Stuart Nichols; 15      Nos. KT ACWP-PRIV00004298 through 4304	114		14      Exhibit 76 Email thread with attachment from 15      Selina Lopez dated 3/14/01; Nos. 16      KT ACWP-PRIV00002371 through 2377	198	
17      Exhibit 56 Email thread from Stuart Nichols dated 18      1/6/2000; Nos. KTACWP-PRIV00004938 19      through 4940	124		15      Exhibit 77 Memo from Stu Nichols dated 3/19/01; 16      Nos. KT ACWP-PRIV00002391 through 2395	198	
20      Exhibit 57 Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of 21      Directors KLA-Tencor Corporation January 22      25, 2000; Nos. MLB/KLA-SEC00021958 23      through 21961	132		16      Exhibit 78 Email thread from Stuart Nichols dated 24      3/22/01; Nos. MLB/KLA-SEC00050838	198	
25      Exhibit 58 Email thread from Leslie Wilson dated 1/22/00; Nos. MLB/KLA-SEC00051399 through 51400.	133		17      Exhibit 79 Email thread from Stuart Nichols dated 26      3/22/01; Nos. KT ACWP-PRIV00001817	198	
1        Exhibit 59 Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of 2        Directors of KLA-Tencor Corporation 3        April 25, 2000; Nos. MLB/KLA-SEC00021983 4        through 21984	136		18      Exhibit 80 Email thread from Roger Stern dated 19      3/22/01; Nos. KLA-SEC000007	198	
20      Exhibit 60 KLA-Tencor Historical Stock Prices; 21      20 pages	153		20      Exhibit 81 Email thread from Stuart Nichols dated 21      3/22/01; Nos. KT ACWP-PRIV00002389	198	
23      Exhibit 61 Email thread of Stuart Nichols dated 24      10/9/00; Nos. MLB/KLA-SEC00022981 25      through 22982	155		22      Exhibit 82 Email thread from Stuart Nichols dated 23      3/22/01; Nos. KT ACWP-PRIV00002397 24      through 2399	199	
Page 7			25      Exhibit 83 Complaint		
1        I N D E X (Continued)			Page 9		
2        EXHIBITS			1        I N D E X (Continued)		
3        No.	Description	Page	2        EXHIBITS		
4        Exhibit 62 Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of 5        Directors of KLA-Tencor Corporation Oct. 6        15, 2000; Nos. MLB/KLA-SEC00022086 7        through 22089.	159		3        No.	Description	Page
8        Exhibit 63 Employee Retention Stock Option Issue 9        Oct. 30, 2000; Nos. KT ACWP-PRIV00002401 10      through 2415	160		5        Exhibit 84 Stock Option Committee Procedures; 6        No. MLB/KLA-SEC00022989	220	
11      Exhibit 64 Employee Retention Stock Option Program 12      Proposal for the Compensation Committee; 13      Nos. MLB/KLA-SEC00004879 through 4898	163		7        QUESTIONS WITNESS INSTRUCTED NOT TO ANSWER		
14      Exhibit 65 Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of 15      Directors of KLA-Tencor Corporation 16      Nov. 10, 2000; Nos. MLB/KLA-SEC00004903 17      through 4907	164		8        Page	Line	
18      Exhibit 66 Minutes of the Meeting of the 19      Compensation Committee of KLA-Tencor 20      Corp.; Nos. MLB/KLA-SEC00004872 through 21      4876	164		10      43	11	
22      Exhibit 67 Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of 23      Directors of KLA Instruments Corp. Apr. 24      28, 1997; Nos. MLB/KLA-SEC00050391 25      through 50458	193		11      109	21	
19      Exhibit 68 Email thread from Joy Nyberg dated 20      3/12/01; No. MLB/KLA-SEC00052175	198		12      112	24	
21      Exhibit 69 Email thread from Stuart Nichols dated 22      3/13/01; Nos. KT ACWP-PRIV00001924 23      through 1925	198		13      118	1	
24      Exhibit 70 Email thread from Stuart Nichols dated 25      3/13/01; Nos. KT ACWP-PRIV00001903 1        through 1904	198		14      119	9	
2        Exhibit 71 Email thread from Bret DiMarco dated 3        3/13/01; Nos. KLA-SEC000042 through 45	198		15      120	4	
4        Exhibit 72 Email with attachment from Stuart 5        Nichols dated 3/14/01; Nos. 6        KT ACWP-PRIV00001905 through 1909			16      122	11	
7        Exhibit 73 Email with attachment from Roger 8        Stern dated 3/14/01; Nos. 9        KT ACWP-PRIV00002365 through 2370			17      127	5	
10      Exhibit 74 Email thread with attachment from 11      Bret DiMarco dated 3/14/01; Nos. 12      KT ACWP-PRIV00001328 through 2381			18      128	4	
13      Exhibit 75 Email thread from Bret DiMarco dated 14      3/14/01; Nos. KT ACWP-PRIV00001327 15      through 2370			19      128	13	
16      Exhibit 76 Email thread with attachment from 17      Selina Lopez dated 3/14/01; Nos. 18      KT ACWP-PRIV00002371 through 2377			20      131	18	
19      Exhibit 77 Memo from Stu Nichols dated 3/19/01; 20      Nos. KT ACWP-PRIV00002391 through 2395			21      135	23	
22      Exhibit 78 Email thread from Stuart Nichols dated 23      3/22/01; Nos. KT ACWP-PRIV00002397 24      through 2399			22      140	3	
25      Exhibit 79 Email thread from Stuart Nichols dated 1        3/22/01; Nos. KLA-SEC000007			23      142	6	
2        Exhibit 80 Email thread from Roger Stern dated 3        3/22/01; Nos. KLA-SEC000007			24      155	7	
4        Exhibit 81 Email thread from Stuart Nichols dated 5        3/22/01; Nos. KT ACWP-PRIV00002389			25      164	8	
6        Exhibit 82 Email thread from Stuart Nichols dated 7        3/22/01; Nos. KT ACWP-PRIV00002397			19      167	15	
8        Exhibit 83 Complaint			20		
9			21		
10			22		
11			23		
12			24		
13			25		

3 (Pages 6 to 9)

Nichols, Stuart J. Esq.

1/27/2008

<p>1 EAST PALO ALTO, CALIFORNIA;  2 SUNDAY, JANUARY 27, 2008; 9:48 A.M.  3 --oo--  4 (Whereupon, Exhibits 41 through 49  5 were marked for identification off  6 the record)  7 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Good morning. We're  8 going on the record.  9 Here marks the beginning of videotape  10 No. 1, Volume I, in the deposition of Stuart J.  11 Nichols in the matter of Securities and Exchange  12 Commission versus Kenneth L. Schroeder, in the  13 United States District Court, Northern District  14 of California, case No. C 07-3798-JW.  15 Today's date is January 27th, 2008, and  16 the time is 9:48 a.m.  17 The video operator today is Gary Brewer  18 representing LiveNote World Service, located at  19 221 Main Street, Suite 1250, San Francisco,  20 California, 94105. The phone number is  21 415-321-2300.  22 The court reporter is Janis Jennings of  23 LiveNote.  24 Would counsel please identify themselves  25 and state whom they represent.</p>	<p>Page 10</p> <p>1 EXAMINATION  2 BY MS. WEISS:  3 Q. Good morning, sir. Would you please state  4 your full name and spell your last name for the  5 record.  6 A. Stuart John Nichols. My last name is  7 spelled N-i-c-h-o-l-s.  8 Q. Mr. Nichols, my name is Shirli Weiss. I  9 represent Kenneth Schroeder who is the defendant in  10 this action. You are here pursuant to a subpoena  11 served on your counsel with agreements from him to  12 accept it on your behalf.  13 I'm going to be asking you some questions  14 about the action and my questions and your answers  15 will be taken down by the court reporter.  16 So that we have a clear record, I'll ask  17 that you wait until I finish my question before you  18 commence your answer, and I'll wait until you finish  19 your answer before I commence my next question.  20 Can we have that agreement?  21 A. Yes.  22 Q. You are a member of the California Bar,  23 are you, sir?  24 A. Yes.  25 Q. Can you tell me if you are a member of any</p>
<p>1 MS. WEISS: Good morning. My name is  2 Shirli Weiss. I'm from DLA Piper and I represent  3 the Defendant Kenneth L. Schroeder  4 MR. COOPERSMITH: I'm Jeff Coopersmith  5 also with DLA Piper and I also represent Kenneth  6 Schroeder.  7 MR. BELNICK: I'm Mark Belnick and I  8 represent the witness Stuart Nichols.  9 MR. HEMANN: John Hemann of Morgan Lewis  10 on behalf of KLA-Tencor.  11 MS. HEINTZ: Tera Heintz from Morgan Lewis  12 on behalf of KLA-Tencor.  13 MR. FICKES: Mark Fickes on behalf of the  14 Securities and Exchange Commission.  15 MS. RO: Elena Ro on behalf of the  16 Securities and Exchange Commission.  17 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Okay. If there are no  18 stipulations, the reporter may administer the oath.  19  20 STUART NICHOLS,  21 The deponent herein, was sworn and  22 testified as follows:  23 / / /  24 / / /  25 / / /</p>	<p>Page 11</p> <p>1 other bar in the United States?  2 A. Yes.  3 Q. Which bar?  4 A. No, I can tell you. The answer is no, but  5 you asked me whether I can tell you. And the answer  6 is: No, I'm not a member of another bar.  7 Q. Okay. When did you become a member of the  8 California Bar?  9 A. 1987.  10 Q. Were there any interruptions to that  11 membership?  12 A. No.  13 Q. You remain a member today; is that  14 correct?  15 A. Yes.  16 Q. And that means that you're a lawyer;  17 correct?  18 A. Correct.  19 Q. And you understand that you're under oath  20 to tell the truth?  21 A. Yes.  22 Q. And do you understand that if you lie, you  23 could be subject to penalty of perjury?  24 A. Yes.  25 Q. And you understand that if you respond "I</p>

4 (Pages 10 to 13)

Nichols, Stuart J. Esq.

1/27/2008

<p>1 do not remember" when in fact you do remember, that  2 that is a lie?  3 A. Yes.  4 Q. And you understand that if you respond  5 that you do not know the answer to the question when  6 in fact you do know the answer to the question, that  7 that also is a lie?  8 A. Yes.  9 Q. Sir, you can take a break at any time.  10 Just indicate to your counsel and we'll go off the  11 record by agreement. However, we will not go off  12 the record until all of the parties to the  13 deposition agree that we can go off the record.  14 Could you tell me what your current  15 address is, please.  16 A. 704 Vera Cruz Avenue, Los Altos,  17 California.  18 Q. Are you currently employed?  19 A. Yes.  20 Q. What is the name and address of your  21 employer?  22 A. MIPS Technologies, Inc. The address --  23 the headquarters address is 1225 Charleston Avenue,  24 Mountain View, California.  25 Q. Is "MIPS" short for anything?</p>	<p>Page 14</p> <p>1 custodian of records-type depositions. I've done  2 that several times.  3 Q. And were you testifying as a custodian of  4 records at that deposition?  5 A. Yes.  6 Q. And was that for MIPS?  7 A. No. As I said, I haven't had my  8 deposition taken for a year and a half.  9 Q. I see. Was that for KLA-Tencor?  10 A. Yes.  11 Q. Who brought that litigation?  12 A. Well, your question assumes that there  13 was only one instance, but I think I said there  14 were several, and there were. I don't remember  15 specifically whether it was -- these were cases that  16 we brought or whether they were cases that were  17 brought by -- against us where we were a defendant,  18 or where we were simply a third party that was  19 producing documents in a litigation matter to which  20 we were not a party.  21 Q. Did you testify at all in the litigation  22 that you most recently testified in as a percipient  23 witness at all?  24 A. I do not believe so.  25 Q. All right. Prior to that deposition, had</p>
<p>1 A. No.  2 Q. When did you become employed by MIPS?  3 A. November of 2007.  4 Q. What is the nature of your employment at  5 MIPS?  6 A. I'm the general counsel of the company.  7 Q. I forgot to ask you, Mr. Nichols: Have  8 you taken any medication that you believe might  9 impair your ability to testify truthfully today?  10 A. No.  11 Q. Have you been deposed before?  12 A. Yes.  13 Q. When was the last time you were deposed?  14 A. It has been at least a year and a half. I  15 don't know exactly.  16 Q. Was the deposition in the context of --  17 was it related to KLA's option dating practices?  18 A. No.  19 Q. What was the context of that deposition?  20 A. I don't specifically remember, but it was  21 not an uncommon thing for me to be deposed in the  22 context of subpoenas of records. They would need  23 someone to testify regarding the effort that was  24 made; in the context of litigation, of course.  25 There were requests for production and I would give</p>	<p>Page 15</p> <p>1 you been deposed before?  2 A. Yes.  3 Q. And what was the context of the most  4 recent deposition prior to that one?  5 A. Well, again, there were several instances  6 where I was deposed as in the capacity of a  7 custodian of record -- of records. But I can't  8 distinguish, you know, when they happened or --  9 they were fairly trivial types of depositions.  10 Q. All right. Let's put those aside.  11 Can you call to mind any depositions  12 that you gave where you testified as a percipient  13 witness?  14 And do you know what I mean when I say  15 "percipient"?  16 A. Yes. I can remember one instance where I  17 testified as a 30(b)(6) witness.  18 Q. Was that also on behalf of KLA-Tencor?  19 A. No.  20 Q. What company was that on behalf of?  21 A. This was when I was employed by Varian  22 Associates, Inc.  23 Q. All right. Putting that aside, can you  24 think of any circumstances where you've testified as  25 a percipient witness?</p>

5 (Pages 14 to 17)

Nichols, Stuart J. Esq.

1/27/2008

Page 18	Page 20
<p>1 A. There may have been an instance where I  2 testified while at KLA as a 30(b)(6) witness on some  3 sort of issue about our subsidiary structure. I  4 don't distinctly remember it, but I have a vague  5 memory that I did do that at one point.</p> <p>6 Q. Any other circumstances that you can  7 recall where you testified as a percipient witness?</p> <p>8 A. Yes.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay. Please identify the first that  10 comes to mind.</p> <p>11 A. The first that comes to mind was a  12 deposition in connection with a wrongful termination  13 and trade secret matter.</p> <p>14 Q. Were you a party in that matter or a  15 witness; a nonparty witness?</p> <p>16 A. I was a nonparty witness.</p> <p>17 Q. Just identify who the litigants were in  18 that matter.</p> <p>19 A. I no longer remember the name of the  20 plaintiff. The defendant was Varian Associates,  21 Inc.</p> <p>22 Q. I'm sorry. Did you say "Varian"?</p> <p>23 A. Varian.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay. And you said that was a wrongful  25 termination?</p>	<p>1 who sits to your right?</p> <p>2 A. Yes.</p> <p>3 Q. All right. Mr. John Hemann has asked to  4 attend today's deposition. Mr. Hemann is outside  5 counsel, as I understand it, for KLA-Tencor.</p> <p>6 Have you met with Mr. Hemann in connection  7 with your deposition today?</p> <p>8 A. No.</p> <p>9 Q. If I refer to "KLA option practices," I'm  10 referring to the broad spectrum of KLA's option  11 practices during the entire time period of your  12 tenure with the company and thereafter just as a  13 broad shorthand.</p> <p>14 Have you met with the agents of the SEC  15 prior to today in connection with KLA's option  16 practices?</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 Q. How many times can you recall meeting with  19 agents of the SEC?</p> <p>20 A. Once.</p> <p>21 Q. The approximate time period, do you  22 recall?</p> <p>23 A. I believe it was late 2006.</p> <p>24 Q. Do you keep a calendar that would tell you  25 the day that you met with the SEC?</p>
Page 19	Page 21
<p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. Were you general counsel when you were at  3 Varian?</p> <p>4 A. No.</p> <p>5 Q. How long ago was that deposition given?</p> <p>6 A. At least six years ago.</p> <p>7 Q. All right. Putting aside that instance,  8 can you recall any other circumstances where you  9 testified as a percipient witness?</p> <p>10 A. No.</p> <p>11 Q. And have you ever been a party to a  12 litigation?</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 Q. Let's put aside for the moment litigations  15 arising out of KLA-Tencor's option practices. Other  16 than litigation arising out of that subject matter,  17 have you been a party to a litigation?</p> <p>18 A. No.</p> <p>19 Q. Did you review documents in preparation  20 for your deposition today?</p> <p>21 A. No.</p> <p>22 Q. Have you had an opportunity to speak with  23 your counsel?</p> <p>24 A. Yes.</p> <p>25 Q. And would you identify is that Mr. Belnick</p>	<p>1 A. No.</p> <p>2 Q. If you needed to remember the date, how  3 would you track down that date?</p> <p>4 A. How would I? I would probably go back to  5 some old email.</p> <p>6 Q. What is your email address?</p> <p>7 A. Stu, S-t-u, .nichols@gmail.com.</p> <p>8 Q. I believe you said you met with the SEC  9 one time; is that correct?</p> <p>10 A. Correct.</p> <p>11 Q. And who do you recall was present at that  12 meeting?</p> <p>13 A. Let's see, my counsel, Mark Belnick.</p> <p>14 There was at least one representative of the Office  15 of the U.S. Attorney; his name was I believe Michael  16 Wong. There were two representatives of the FBI  17 whose names I don't recall. And there was at least  18 one representative of the SEC, and her name is  19 Elena Ro.</p> <p>20 Q. And that's Miss Ro who is in attendance  21 today?</p> <p>22 A. That's correct.</p> <p>23 Q. Do you know who called for that meeting?</p> <p>24 A. No, I don't.</p> <p>25 Q. When you attended that meeting, were you</p>

6 (Pages 18 to 21)

Nichols, Stuart J. Esq.

1/27/2008

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 22</p> <p>1 questioned with respect to KLA's option practices?</p> <p>2 A. Yes.</p> <p>3 Q. Were you questioned concerning</p> <p>4 communications that you had while you were general</p> <p>5 counsel at KLA-Tencor?</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. Were you general counsel at KLA-Tencor?</p> <p>8 A. I believe at that point I was no longer,</p> <p>9 though I don't have the date fixed in my head.</p> <p>10 Q. What was the approximate time period that</p> <p>11 you were general counsel at KLA-Tencor?</p> <p>12 A. My start date was I believe October 25th</p> <p>13 of 1999, and my resignation date was October 16th</p> <p>14 of 2006.</p> <p>15 Q. I believe you stated that you made</p> <p>16 statements during the meeting concerning your</p> <p>17 communications with -- well, let me ask you.</p> <p>18 You were asked at the meeting about</p> <p>19 communications that you had as general counsel with</p> <p>20 KLA-Tencor with personnel at KLA-Tencor; is that</p> <p>21 correct?</p> <p>22 A. That's correct.</p> <p>23 Q. And you were also asked questions with</p> <p>24 respect to communications that you had as general</p> <p>25 counsel of KLA-Tencor with KLA-Tencor's outside</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24</p> <p>1 Shall we have that understanding?</p> <p>2 A. Yup.</p> <p>3 Q. You may have been asked questions about</p> <p>4 your communications with board members; is that</p> <p>5 correct?</p> <p>6 A. I may have, yes.</p> <p>7 Q. While you answered questions, did you make</p> <p>8 a record of your interview?</p> <p>9 A. No.</p> <p>10 Q. And did you observe anyone else in the</p> <p>11 room making a record of your interview?</p> <p>12 A. The other attorneys who were observing the</p> <p>13 deposition may well have taken notes. I don't have</p> <p>14 a specific memory about whether they did or didn't.</p> <p>15 Q. While you were questioned about your</p> <p>16 communications with KLA personnel, did you assert</p> <p>17 the attorney-client privilege on behalf of the</p> <p>18 company in response to those questions or did your</p> <p>19 attorney assert them on your behalf?</p> <p>20 MR. BELNICK: Maybe I can help with this.</p> <p>21 Before Mr. Nichols answered any questions I obtained</p> <p>22 a representation from Mr. Wong and I believe SEC</p> <p>23 counsel that KLA was cooperating with their</p> <p>24 inquiries. This was prior, as you know, to this</p> <p>25 lawsuit. And that Mr. Nichols was therefore free to</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 23</p> <p>1 counsel; is that correct?</p> <p>2 A. Yes, that's correct.</p> <p>3 Q. Can you recall any other general</p> <p>4 categories of communications that you were</p> <p>5 questioned about by either the SEC or the</p> <p>6 representatives of the U.S. Attorneys Office?</p> <p>7 A. I'm not sure what you mean by "general</p> <p>8 categories of communication." Can you be more</p> <p>9 specific?</p> <p>10 Q. Yes. I think we identified communications</p> <p>11 that you had with KLA personnel. We also identified</p> <p>12 communications that you had with outside counsel for</p> <p>13 KLA. Were you questioned about any other categories</p> <p>14 of communications, such as communications with</p> <p>15 persons outside of KLA who were not outside counsel</p> <p>16 and who were not KLA personnel?</p> <p>17 A. So I guess it depends. I may have</p> <p>18 been asked about communications with KLA's board</p> <p>19 members. And I don't know whether when you use</p> <p>20 the phrase "KLA personnel" you're including board</p> <p>21 members.</p> <p>22 Q. Thank you for that clarification. For</p> <p>23 purposes of my questions I will include KLA's board</p> <p>24 of directors or former members of the board in the</p> <p>25 category of "KLA personnel."</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 25</p> <p>1 answer questions that otherwise would be privileged.</p> <p>2 I left the room and I called KLA's then</p> <p>3 general counsel, Mr. Gross I believe his name was,</p> <p>4 and either he or someone from his office confirmed</p> <p>5 to me over the telephone that the government's</p> <p>6 representation to me was accurate and that with</p> <p>7 respect to the Justice Department and the SEC,</p> <p>8 Mr. Nichols was free to answer any inquiry even</p> <p>9 though it might otherwise be considered subject</p> <p>10 to the attorney-client privilege or work product</p> <p>11 immunity. And on that basis, thereafter I made no</p> <p>12 objections on privilege grounds.</p> <p>13 MS. WEISS: And so your understanding as a</p> <p>14 result of your conversation with Mr. Gross was that</p> <p>15 you were not obliged or even requested to assert the</p> <p>16 attorney-client privilege in response to questions</p> <p>17 about Mr. Nichols' communications with KLA</p> <p>18 personnel; is that correct?</p> <p>19 MR. BELNICK: That's correct. Not only</p> <p>20 that I was not obliged to and that I should not.</p> <p>21 MS. WEISS: And the same question with</p> <p>22 respect to the work product doctrine, that you were</p> <p>23 not either requested or required to assert that</p> <p>24 privilege, and that indeed you were being requested</p> <p>25 by the company to respond -- to have Mr. Nichols</p>

7 (Pages 22 to 25)

Nichols, Stuart J. Esq.

1/27/2008

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 26</p> <p>1 respond to the questions of both the SEC and the 2 U.S. Attorneys Office; is that correct?</p> <p>3 MR. BELNICK: Essentially, yes.</p> <p>4 BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>5 Q. Mr. Nichols, are you aware of any 6 confidentiality agreements between KLA-Tencor 7 and the U.S. Attorneys Office?</p> <p>8 A. No.</p> <p>9 Q. Are you aware of any confidentiality 10 agreements between KLA-Tencor and the Securities 11 and Exchange Commission?</p> <p>12 A. No.</p> <p>13 Q. Was anyone else present other than the 14 people that you identified that you can think of?</p> <p>15 A. No.</p> <p>16 Q. Were you there pursuant to subpoena or 17 voluntarily?</p> <p>18 A. I believe I was there voluntarily.</p> <p>19 Q. During the time that you answered 20 questions posed to you, were you shown documents?</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 Q. Were any of the documents -- did any of 23 the documents reflect what you would have believed 24 were attorney-client privileged communications 25 between yourself and other people?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 28</p> <p>1 knowledge?</p> <p>2 A. Not that I know of.</p> <p>3 Q. Following that interview, were you 4 contacted by any representatives of the SEC to give 5 any follow-up statements, either through a meeting 6 or in writing or by telephone?</p> <p>7 A. Was I personally contacted?</p> <p>8 Q. Were you contacted either directly or 9 through your counsel.</p> <p>10 A. Yeah. I believe that my counsel was 11 contacted.</p> <p>12 Q. Did you turn over additional statements 13 following that interview which you understood would 14 be turned over to the government?</p> <p>15 A. When you say "turn over," what do you 16 mean?</p> <p>17 Q. Did you write anything down that you 18 understood would be turned over to the government?</p> <p>19 A. Did I personally write anything down?</p> <p>20 Q. Yes. Or participate in a writing that was 21 turned over to the government.</p> <p>22 A. Well, a written submission was made after 23 the interview on my behalf.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay. This is a Wells submission?</p> <p>25 MR. BELNICK: Let me answer it was not.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 27</p> <p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. Generally what other categories of 3 documents were you shown at that meeting?</p> <p>4 A. Meaning documents that would not be 5 privileged, that I did not think were subject to 6 the privilege?</p> <p>7 Q. Or not subject to the attorney-client 8 privilege. In other words, research, PowerPoint, 9 memoranda, anything like that.</p> <p>10 A. I don't remember any PowerPoints. I don't 11 know what you mean by "research." But I don't -- 12 if you mean legal research, or for that matter 13 technical research, I don't remember anything along 14 those lines. I do remember SEC filings. And there 15 may have been, for instance, email that was not -- 16 that I would not have deemed to be subject to the 17 privilege that I talked about.</p> <p>18 Q. How long did the interview last?</p> <p>19 A. I believe we started at 9:00 or 10:00 and 20 we concluded at 4:00 or 4:30, something like that. 21 Maybe it was 5:00. I don't remember exactly.</p> <p>22 Q. I take it that the interview was not 23 transcribed?</p> <p>24 A. Correct.</p> <p>25 Q. And it was not recorded, to your</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 29</p> <p>1 MS. WEISS: You did not make a Wells 2 submission?</p> <p>3 MR. BELNICK: Correct. It was a 4 submission made by counsel; mainly me and my 5 co-counsel, Akin Gump. And it was confidential 6 and subject to FOIA, and still is as far as I'm 7 concerned. And we made the appropriate requests at 8 the time for FOIA treatment and confidentiality, and 9 those are still in effect, those requests.</p> <p>10 MS. WEISS: Was the submission that was 11 made made solely to the SEC?</p> <p>12 MR. BELNICK: Yes.</p> <p>13 BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>14 Q. Mr. Nichols, do you know if a submission 15 was made to the U.S. Attorneys Office?</p> <p>16 A. I'm not aware of any submission made to 17 the U.S. Attorneys Office.</p> <p>18 MR. BELNICK: The answer is no.</p> <p>19 BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>20 Q. Other than the submission that your 21 counsel identified, did you make any other 22 submissions to either the SEC or the U.S. Attorneys 23 Office?</p> <p>24 A. No, not that I'm aware of.</p> <p>25 Q. Were you contacted for any follow-up</p>

8 (Pages 26 to 29)

Nichols, Stuart J. Esq.

1/27/2008

Page 30	Page 32
<p>1 questioning up until today by either of those  2 agencies?</p> <p>3 A. No.</p> <p>4 Q. Since -- do you recall generally press  5 about potential option dates being retrospectively  6 selected in about May of 2006? Do you recall  7 generally that time period? Wall Street Journal  8 articles or other articles?</p> <p>9 A. Yes.</p> <p>10 Q. Since that time period, Mr. Nichols, have  11 you had any communications with the press?</p> <p>12 A. Regarding stock option matters?</p> <p>13 Q. Yes.</p> <p>14 A. No.</p> <p>15 Q. Communications involving yourself appeared  16 in the press before the complaint was filed against  17 my client, Mr. Schroeder, which was filed in July of  18 2007. Do you know who gave those communications to  19 the press?</p> <p>20 A. You'll have to be clearer on what  21 communications you're talking about. I'm not  22 sure what you're referring to.</p> <p>23 Q. Do you recall any -- reading any press  24 about KLA-Tencor and your communications with  25 Mr. Schroeder that were discussed in the press?</p>	<p>1 the "Special Committee" in my questioning.  2 I understand that you met with the Special  3 Committee after May of 2006; is that correct?</p> <p>4 MR. BELNICK: Could you clarify if you  5 mean the board members on the committee itself or  6 their counsel?</p> <p>7 BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>8 Q. I was going to ask you about the  9 attendees, but --</p> <p>10 MR. BELNICK: I think it will be faster if  11 you divide it.</p> <p>12 MS. WEISS: All right.</p> <p>13 MR. HEMANN: Shirli, I think this is  14 probably a good time for me to interject that as a  15 general matter, we have advised Mr. Nichols through  16 his attorney that KLA-Tencor, which would include  17 any committees or members of the board of  18 director -- the directors of KLA-Tencor or their  19 counsel, do not waive any privilege that might be  20 applicable, including the attorney-client or the  21 attorney work product privilege.</p> <p>22 And we have requested Mr. Nichols through  23 his counsel, Mr. Belnick, that he adhere to his  24 ethical statutory and fiduciary duties, such as they  25 are, and take all necessary steps to protect both</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Page 31</p> <p>1 A. There were a number of different articles,  2 different press items; so, yeah, I remember a number  3 of different things in the press.</p> <p>4 Q. Do you know of anyone who delivered or  5 gave information about your communications with  6 Mr. Schroeder to any member of the press or media?</p> <p>7 A. No.</p> <p>8 Q. Do you have any facts on which you can  9 base a suspicion that any particular person gave  10 copies of your communications to the press that  11 involved your communications with Mr. Schroeder?</p> <p>12 MR. BELNICK: Just for the record, I  13 object to him being asked for suspicions.</p> <p>14 But you may answer.</p> <p>15 THE WITNESS: No.</p> <p>16 MR. FICKES: I also object the question  17 calls for speculation.</p> <p>18 BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>19 Q. Sir, you were aware that the board of  20 directors of KLA-Tencor at some point after May 1st,  21 2006, formed what they called the Special Committee  22 of the board to investigate KLA-Tencor's option  23 practices?</p> <p>24 A. Yes, I'm aware of that.</p> <p>25 Q. All right. So I'll refer to that maybe as</p>	<p>1 the attorney-client privilege and the attorney work  2 product privilege doctrine as he answers questions  3 today.</p> <p>4 And I don't know where exactly this  5 particular set of questions is going, but I wanted  6 to make it clear that the company has made that  7 request. To the extent that a question that you ask  8 would reveal in Mr. Nichols' answer privileged  9 information; privileged under either the work  10 product doctrine, the attorney-client privilege,  11 we've asked Mr. Nichols to decline to answer the  12 question.</p> <p>13 And Mr. Belnick will make an observation  14 if he feels that Mr. Nichols' answer will  15 reveal such information, and on that basis of  16 Mr. Belnick's observation, we would ask Mr. Nichols  17 not to answer the question.</p> <p>18 MS. WEISS: All right. As I understand  19 your comments, Mr. Hemann, on behalf of KLA-Tencor  20 you would instruct Mr. Nichols not to respond to  21 questions concerning the content of communications  22 between Mr. Nichols and KLA-Tencor's Special  23 Committee --</p> <p>24 MR. HEMANN: Correct.</p> <p>25 MS. WEISS: -- including the members of</p>

9 (Pages 30 to 33)

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 34</p> <p>1 the Special Committee or the counsel acting for 2 their members; is that correct? 3 MR. HEMANN: That's correct. 4 MS. WEISS: Is that the same instruction 5 that you would make with respect to all of 6 KLA-Tencor's current and former personnel? 7 MR. HEMANN: Yes. 8 MS. WEISS: Would that also be true 9 with respect to the assertion of the work product 10 doctrine with respect to all current and former 11 inside attorneys of KLA-Tencor? 12 MR. HEMANN: Yes. 13 MS. WEISS: That is to say that to the 14 extent that they met with the Special Committee, 15 you would instruct them not to respond to my 16 questions -- 17 MR. HEMANN: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm sorry. 18 I thought you were talking about Mr. Nichols' 19 communications with attorneys for KLA-Tencor. 20 I would instruct Mr. Nichols not to -- I 21 would advise Mr. Nichols that the company is taking 22 the position that his communications with attorneys 23 for KLA-Tencor, whether inside attorneys or outside 24 attorneys, are protected by some combination of 25 the attorney-client privilege and the attorney work</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 36</p> <p>1 MR. HEMANN: Yes. 2 MS. WEISS: And would it be your 3 instruction to each of KLA-Tencor's current and 4 former in-house counsel that they are not to respond 5 to questions that I pose to them as witnesses 6 regarding their communications with the Special 7 Committee or its counsel on the basis of the work 8 product doctrine? 9 MR. HEMANN: I think my comments and 10 positions today are directed solely to Mr. Nichols. 11 I'd be happy to talk to you after the deposition 12 about other potential witnesses. 13 MS. WEISS: Well, Counsel, we'd like to 14 make a clear record today of KLA's intentions with 15 respect to instructions to witnesses so that we 16 don't have to take more witness' depositions before 17 we approach the court with these issues. 18 So these issues have been vetted over many 19 weeks now. Are you not prepared to tell me what 20 the company's position is with respect to other 21 attorneys that I call as witnesses as far as the 22 assertion of the attorney-client privilege and 23 the work product doctrine is concerned? 24 MR. HEMANN: I'm prepared to meet and 25 confer with you about other witnesses outside</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 35</p> <p>1 product doctrine. 2 MS. WEISS: Okay. Right now I'm just on 3 the Special Committee. 4 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: I'm sorry. Is your 5 BlackBerry on? 6 MR. HEMANN: Yes. I can turn it off. 7 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Somebody is starting to 8 interfere with the audio. 9 MS. WEISS: You may actually have to put 10 it remotely. I've had trouble with Blackberrys that 11 are even off. 12 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Thank you. 13 MS. WEISS: Okay. Mr. Hemann, what I'd 14 like to do is, first of all, segregate the Special 15 Committee. And I think you were clear about your 16 instruction with respect to the attorney-client 17 privilege. 18 I'm moving now to the work product 19 protection. As to Mr. Nichols' communications with 20 the Special Committee or the Special Committee's 21 counsel, is it your instruction to him not to 22 respond to questions on the grounds that asks for 23 his communications to those personnel; the Special 24 Committee or their counsel, on the grounds of the 25 work product doctrine?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 37</p> <p>1 the context of Mr. Nichols' deposition. 2 MS. WEISS: Mr. Nichols -- 3 MR. BELNICK: Can I just make a brief 4 statement? 5 MS. WEISS: Please. 6 MR. BELNICK: Just to make clear, as 7 I indicated both to you and Mr. Hemann and our 8 communication before deposition when Mr. Hemann gave 9 the instructions he described, Mr. Nichols, as a 10 lawyer, former general counsel for KLA, obviously 11 has fiduciary ethical and legal obligations and so 12 he has no choice. 13 And I'm neither criticizing or applauding, 14 but he obviously has no choice but to follow the 15 instructions of KLA and its counsel, and therefore 16 he will follow the instruction that Mr. Hemann just 17 put on the record. 18 And if all or part -- or the substantial 19 part of an answer would involve privileged or work 20 product, I have no choice but to say "privilege"; 21 meaning he can't answer it. Not because he doesn't 22 want to answer or I don't want him to answer, but 23 because he has no choice as a lawyer other than to 24 follow his former clients' request and direction. 25 MS. WEISS: I understand, Mr. Belnick.</p>

Nichols, Stuart J. Esq.

1/27/2008

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 38</p> <p>1 And to the extent that I continue to ask questions 2 that call for communications which you deem 3 privileged, my purpose is going to be to elicit your 4 objection and make a record from which a court can 5 infer your intentions specifically and generally. 6 And Mr. Hemann's intentions. 7 So that will be my purpose in pursuing 8 lines of questioning as to which you've already made 9 your position. 10 MR. BELNICK: I understand. And just 11 two quick points on that so we can get back to 12 the record. First, just so it's clear, when you 13 say "your"; meaning looking at me, they're not my 14 objections. They're KLA's objections and we are 15 adhering to them. 16 Second, I would hope, but it's entirely 17 up to you, that given the statement Mr. Hemann has 18 made, it's fairly clear that there's not going to be 19 very much that Mr. Nichols can answer so I would 20 request that you -- we try to limit the record 21 building for the sake of saving everyone's time. 22 But I'm certainly not going to stop you or try to 23 stop you. 24 MS. WEISS: Okay. Thank you, sir. 25 BY MS. WEISS:</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 40</p> <p>1 apologize. 2 BY MS. WEISS: 3 Q. Mr. Nichols, if you met on more than three 4 occasions, do you think you would remember that? 5 A. Yes. 6 Q. Did you make calendar entries as to when 7 you met with the Special Committee? 8 A. I may have. 9 Q. Did you meet with the SEC before or after 10 you met with the Special Committee? And if it was 11 in between, you can tell me that, too. 12 A. I really don't remember the timing. 13 Q. Okay. The memoranda turned over to us 14 with respect to July 28th, 2006, states that the 15 people who were in attendance at your interview 16 were the following: Richard Marmaro, Jack Dicarlo, 17 Elizabeth Harlan, all from the Skadden Arps Law 18 Firm; Steven Daughters from LECG, which I understand 19 was their forensic consultant; Mr. Belnick by 20 telephone; yourself. 21 Do you recall anyone else being present at 22 that interview? 23 A. I have a memory that there was a second 24 representative of LECG. Other than that -- and I 25 wouldn't have been able to come up with a name of</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 39</p> <p>1 Q. Mr. Nichols, the notes, the final 2 memoranda that the Special Committee counsel 3 prepared of your interviews with the Special 4 Committee, were turned over, as I understand 5 it, to Mr. Schroeder by the SEC in compliance with 6 Rule 26 in this litigation. 7 I am going to read to you the dates of the 8 interviews that I have and ask you whether or not 9 you generally recall that those were the dates that 10 you met with the committee. So the dates that I 11 have are July 28th, 2006; August 4th, 2006; and 12 September 18th, 2006. 13 Is that generally your recollection as to 14 when you met with the Special Committee? 15 A. That sounds generally right. 16 MR. BELNICK: On all three of those 17 occasions? 18 Because I think the witness' recollection 19 was -- and I think he was correct -- that he met 20 only once with them. 21 THE WITNESS: No, no. 22 MR. BELNICK: I'm misunderstanding then. 23 THE WITNESS: She's referring to the 24 Special Committee, not to the SEC. 25 MR. BELNICK: Oh, I apologize. I</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 41</p> <p>1 Mr. Daughters, but I just remember that there were 2 two -- I thought I remember there being two LECG 3 people there. 4 Q. All right. Other than that person, do 5 you recall anyone else being in attendance at that 6 meeting? 7 A. No. 8 Q. Who, as you understood it at that time, 9 were the members of the Special Committee itself? 10 A. The members of the Special Committee 11 itself were Ray Bingham and -- I'm blanking on his 12 name. 13 Q. Steven Kaufman? 14 A. Thank you. Steven Kaufman. 15 Q. Did you meet with either Mr. Bingham or 16 Mr. Kaufman, or both, at any time in connection 17 with KLA-Tencor's investigation of its stock option 18 practices? 19 A. Yes. 20 Q. How many times did you meet with 21 Mr. Bingham? 22 A. You're referring now to in-person meetings 23 as opposed to telephone meetings? 24 Q. Let's start with the in-person meetings. 25 A. I recall only one in-person meeting with</p>

11 (Pages 38 to 41)

Nichols, Stuart J. Esq.

1/27/2008

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 42</p> <p>1 Ray Bingham in connection with his responsibilities 2 relative to the Special Committee. 3 Q. And at the time that you met with 4 Mr. Bingham, was he questioning you with respect 5 to your past communications at KLA-Tencor? 6 A. No. 7 Q. Was it a meeting in connection with 8 his responsibilities as a member of the Special 9 Committee? 10 A. Yes. 11 Q. Was there a second meeting with 12 Mr. Bingham? 13 A. Not that I recall. 14 Q. Was there any time that Mr. Bingham 15 participated personally in an interview of you 16 with respect to the investigation? 17 A. No. 18 Q. Okay. Moving to Mr. Kaufman. How many 19 times did you meet with him either in person or by 20 telephone? 21 A. I don't believe I ever met with him in 22 person in connection with his responsibilities on 23 the Special Committee. 24 Q. Okay. Or by telephone? 25 A. I remember at least one meeting that he --</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 44</p> <p>1 MR. BELNICK: It is my instruction to 2 the witness -- just so it's clear, Shirli, I'm not 3 trying to mince words -- is he needs to follow KLA's 4 direction. And the direction, as I understand it 5 and as you understand it, is that KLA has directed 6 him not to answer questions that we believe would 7 implicate attorney-client privilege or work product, 8 and we're following that direction. 9 MS. WEISS: Okay. And just so that 10 we don't have to keep repeating that every time, 11 let's have an agreement that when I say, "Are you 12 instructing him not to answer" and you say "Yes," 13 that will mean that you are instructing him not to 14 answer based on the instruction of KLA which in turn 15 is based on the attorney-client privilege and the 16 work product doctrine. 17 MR. BELNICK: Correct. Just so long as 18 it's clear that it's not Mr. Nichols or his counsel 19 who made decisions on whether the privilege exists 20 or doesn't exist. We have no position on that. 21 MS. WEISS: Very good. 22 MR. BELNICK: I mean, the privilege 23 exists and we don't take any position. I understand 24 there's a waiver issue pending. We're not taking 25 any positions on whether anything has been waived</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 43</p> <p>1 in which he participated by phone. 2 Q. Was the purpose of that meeting, as you 3 understood it, to provide your advice to him as to 4 his responsibilities as a member of that committee? 5 A. No. 6 Q. What was the purpose of the meeting with 7 Mr. Kaufman? 8 A. Well, it was a phone meeting that he 9 participated in by phone that included a number 10 of other people, including Ray Bingham in person. 11 Q. And what was the purpose of that meeting, 12 as you understood it? 13 MR. BELNICK: One second, please. I'm 14 trying to ascertain if we have a privilege issue 15 here. 16 MS. WEISS: Sure. 17 (Discussion off the record between 18 Deponent and Counsel.) 19 MR. BELNICK: I believe that the answer 20 will implicate the privilege, at least work product 21 and perhaps attorney-client as well, so we'll have 22 to follow KLA's instruction and respectfully 23 decline. 24 MS. WEISS: Okay. And your instruction is 25 to the witness not to answer the question; correct?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 45</p> <p>1 or not. 2 MS. WEISS: I understand. 3 MR. BELNICK: We're following KLA's 4 direction. 5 MS. WEISS: I understand. 6 THE WITNESS: And just to be clear, if you 7 instruct me not to answer relative to a privilege 8 issue that exists within -- between you and me, you 9 need to make that clear; right? 10 MR. BELNICK: Thanks. 11 THE WITNESS: I mean, I don't want every 12 instruction to be construed as an instruction 13 based -- 14 MR. BELNICK: I know. Don't worry. If 15 Shirli goes after our top secret confidential 16 discussions, I'll make it clear. 17 BY MS. WEISS: 18 Q. Okay. So I think we were questioning you 19 about Mr. Kaufman and I think you declined to answer 20 a question. 21 A. Well, your question was what was the 22 purpose of this meeting. 23 Q. And you're instructed not to answer -- 24 A. Correct. 25 Q. -- based on the attorney-client privilege</p>

12 (Pages 42 to 45)

Nichols, Stuart J. Esq.

1/27/2008

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 46</p> <p>1 and the work product doctrine.  2 All right. So I have notes from an  3 interview of you that occurred August 4th, 2006.  4 The notes record that Mr. Marmaro, Mr. Dicarlo,  5 Miss Harlan, Mr. Daughters, and Mr. Belnick were at  6 that interview, as well as yourself. Mr. Belnick I  7 don't think made it clear whether he was there by  8 phone or in person.  9 MR. BELNICK: I was in person.  10 BY MS. WEISS:  11 Q. In person.  12 And in addition, on August 4th a gentleman  13 named Joe Anastosi also joined.  14 A. Okay. So it may have been in the second  15 meeting that there were two LECG people present.  16 Because Mr. Anastosi is LECG?  17 Q. Yes.  18 A. Yeah.  19 Q. And does that comport with your  20 recollection?  21 A. Yes.  22 Q. All right. And then there was a third  23 interview that occurred on September 18th, 2006, and  24 at that interview only Mr. Dicarlo and Miss Harlan  25 attended as well as your counsel and yourself and no</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 48</p> <p>1 MR. BELNICK: I'm sorry.  2 THE WITNESS: I do generally recall the  3 instruction.  4 BY MS. WEISS:  5 Q. All right. Now, in addition to the  6 Special Committee, were you also interviewed in  7 connection with your service as general counsel  8 at KLA by something called the Special Litigation  9 Committee of KLA-Tencor at any time?  10 A. Yes.  11 Q. And can you identify approximately when  12 that interview occurred.  13 A. Well, it would have been after the third  14 of the Special Litigation Committee meetings which  15 you have --  16 MR. BELNICK: The third of the Special  17 Committee?  18 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I'm sorry. The third  19 of the Special Committee meetings which you have  20 reminded me occurred in September of '06.  21 BY MS. WEISS:  22 Q. How many meetings did you attend with the  23 Special Litigation Committee?  24 A. I believe there were two.  25 Q. And whom did you understand the Special</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 47</p> <p>1 one else.  2 Does that comport with your recollection?  3 A. Correct. Although I believe Mr. Belnick  4 participated by phone.  5 Q. All right. Now, of those meetings, is  6 there any person that you have a recollection that  7 attended that I didn't mention?  8 A. No.  9 Q. And at those meetings would it be correct  10 to say that the attorney who questioned you said  11 that KLA was the holder of the attorney-client  12 privilege and the work product privilege with  13 respect to that -- the Special Committee's interview  14 of you and could turn the results of that interview  15 as they chose over to third parties?  16 Do you recall that instruction?  17 MR. BELNICK: I'll object to the extent --  18 that it calls for him to make legal conclusions --  19 oh, was it an instruction?  20 BY MS. WEISS:  21 Q. Do you recall that instruction?  22 MR. BELNICK: I strike the objection.  23 BY MS. WEISS:  24 Q. Do you have in mind the question?  25 A. I have in mind the question.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 49</p> <p>1 Litigation Committee to be comprised of?  2 A. Do you mean in terms of the board  3 committee itself who was on that committee?  4 Q. Yes.  5 A. I have a memory that it was Mr. Kaufman  6 and Mr. Wong, but I'm not certain about that.  7 Q. This would be a different Mr. Wong than  8 the Mr. Wong that you identified earlier?  9 A. Correct.  10 Q. And you said you believed that there were  11 two meetings. Can you tell me who attended those  12 meetings to the best of your recollection.  13 A. I believe that Tim Miller from the Skadden  14 firm attended both of them and Jim Lyons attended  15 the first one, and perhaps both.  16 Q. Anyone else?  17 A. I don't believe so.  18 Q. Who took notes?  19 A. Oh, and Mr. Belnick. Pardon me.  20 Mr. Miller and Mr. Lyons may have taken  21 notes.  22 Q. You did not?  23 A. I did not.  24 Q. Backing up to the Special Committee  25 interviews. Would it be correct to say that one of</p>

13 (Pages 46 to 49)

Nichols, Stuart J. Esq.

1/27/2008

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 50</p> <p>1 the attorneys took notes during that interview?</p> <p>2 A. Yes.</p> <p>3 Q. And was that a Skadden attorney that took</p> <p>4 notes?</p> <p>5 A. I don't have a specific memory. I have a</p> <p>6 general memory that Miss Harlan was taking notes.</p> <p>7 Mr. Dicarlo may have taken notes. I don't remember</p> <p>8 one way or another.</p> <p>9 Q. Those notes were not submitted to you at</p> <p>10 any time --</p> <p>11 A. No.</p> <p>12 Q. -- would that be correct?</p> <p>13 Would it be correct that they were not</p> <p>14 submitted?</p> <p>15 A. That would be correct.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. All right. Following your</p> <p>17 meeting with the Special Committee and the Special</p> <p>18 Litigation Committee, have you entered into any</p> <p>19 agreements with the company?</p> <p>20 A. Yes.</p> <p>21 Q. Could you tell me the first agreement</p> <p>22 that comes to mind that you've entered into with</p> <p>23 the company.</p> <p>24 A. The first agreement that comes to mind had</p> <p>25 to do with my laptop computer that I used while I</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 52</p> <p>1 entered into with the company?</p> <p>2 A. Those are the only two that I recall.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay. Have you entered into a settlement</p> <p>4 agreement with the company with respect to the</p> <p>5 pending shareholder derivative litigation?</p> <p>6 A. No.</p> <p>7 Q. Do you have a draft of any such agreement?</p> <p>8 A. No.</p> <p>9 Q. Do you have an understanding with the</p> <p>10 company as to what would happen to you in that</p> <p>11 litigation?</p> <p>12 A. No.</p> <p>13 Q. Will you please summarize your educational</p> <p>14 background, sir.</p> <p>15 A. Starting with where?</p> <p>16 Q. Graduation from high school.</p> <p>17 A. I graduated from high school from</p> <p>18 San Carlos High School in California. I went to</p> <p>19 receive my undergraduate degree at the University</p> <p>20 of California Berkeley. And I received my law</p> <p>21 degree from the University of San Francisco.</p> <p>22 Q. What year did you graduate from Berkeley?</p> <p>23 A. 1983.</p> <p>24 Q. And what year did you graduate from law</p> <p>25 school?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 51</p> <p>1 was at KLA.</p> <p>2 Q. And what was that agreement generally?</p> <p>3 A. In general my concern about my laptop</p> <p>4 was that I had confidential information on</p> <p>5 there relative to other clients with whom I was</p> <p>6 consulting. KLA wanted to preserve the laptop and</p> <p>7 the hard drive.</p> <p>8 And so in general the agreement provided</p> <p>9 that Skadden would be the custodian of the laptop</p> <p>10 and that if it were ever subpoenaed or requested,</p> <p>11 that I would be given notice of that and be given</p> <p>12 the opportunity to take steps to preserve the</p> <p>13 confidentiality of any of the information on there</p> <p>14 that does not relate to KLA.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. And that's an agreement in writing?</p> <p>16 A. Correct.</p> <p>17 Q. Okay. What's the next agreement that you</p> <p>18 entered into with the company, if any?</p> <p>19 A. The next agreement that I entered</p> <p>20 into with the company was in connection with my</p> <p>21 resignation from the company.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. And that was also a written</p> <p>23 agreement?</p> <p>24 A. Correct.</p> <p>25 Q. Okay. What's the next agreement that you</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 53</p> <p>1 A. 1987.</p> <p>2 Q. Do you have any formal training in</p> <p>3 accounting, sir?</p> <p>4 A. No.</p> <p>5 Q. Do you have any informal training in</p> <p>6 accounting?</p> <p>7 A. It depends on how you define "informal."</p> <p>8 Q. Did you receive some on-the-job knowledge</p> <p>9 about accounting in relation to options while you</p> <p>10 were at KLA?</p> <p>11 A. I had exposure to issues relating to</p> <p>12 option -- accounting for options, yes.</p> <p>13 Q. Do you hold any other degrees other than</p> <p>14 those that you've mentioned?</p> <p>15 A. No.</p> <p>16 Q. Do you hold any licenses other than a</p> <p>17 driver's license and your California Bar license?</p> <p>18 A. Well, I'm certified to scuba dive.</p> <p>19 Q. That counts. Anything else?</p> <p>20 A. That's all that comes to mind.</p> <p>21 Q. No real estate or resale licenses or</p> <p>22 anything like that?</p> <p>23 A. No.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay. Following your graduation from law</p> <p>25 school, could you please take me through the steps</p>

14 (Pages 50 to 53)

Nichols, Stuart J. Esq.

1/27/2008

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 54</p> <p>1 of your employment, your professional employment.  2 A. My first job after law school was with  3 a small law firm in San Francisco that was at  4 the time -- well, it's currently named Goodin,  5 MacBride, Squeiri, S-q-u-e-r-i, &amp; Schlotz, I think.  6 I then went in late '89 to Varian Associates, Inc.  7 I left Varian Associates, Inc., in '95 --  8 Q. Okay. Let me just interrupt you here for  9 just a moment. The first group, was that a company  10 or a law firm, did you say?  11 A. Law firm.  12 Q. That was a law firm. Okay. And you said  13 you started with them when?  14 A. Well, I was a law clerk with them before  15 I graduated law school and then I started as an  16 attorney in 1987 after graduating. Yeah.  17 Q. And you stayed until 1989?  18 A. Yes.  19 Q. And your general responsibilities at that  20 time were?  21 A. I was a litigation associate.  22 Q. Okay. And then in 1989 you went with  23 Varian Associates. Was that a law firm or a  24 company?  25 A. A company.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 56</p> <p>1 Q. Did you -- generally did you render advice  2 in connection with the company stock option program  3 while you were at Varian?  4 A. No.  5 Q. Did you receive options while you were at  6 Varian?  7 A. Yes.  8 Q. Can you generally describe how options  9 were granted when you were at Varian?  10 A. No.  11 Q. You had nothing to do with the option  12 process?  13 A. No knowledge of how options were granted  14 at Varian.  15 Q. And you didn't participate in any way,  16 shape or form in the process itself?  17 A. No.  18 Q. Were you in-house general counsel at  19 Varian?  20 A. No.  21 Q. What was your title there?  22 A. Initially it was Associate Corporate  23 Counsel and then shortly thereafter I was promoted  24 to Corporate Counsel.  25 Q. Who was their outside counsel?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 55</p> <p>1 Q. A company. Okay. And where were they  2 based?  3 A. Palo Alto, California.  4 Q. Okay. What kind of company were they?  5 A. A diversified electronics manufacturer.  6 Q. Were they private or public?  7 A. Public.  8 Q. At the time you were with Varian  9 Associates, do you recall whether or not you were  10 awarded any option grants?  11 A. Yes.  12 Q. What did your responsibilities entail at  13 Varian?  14 A. Well, they varied over time.  15 Q. Can you give me a general statement of how  16 they changed over time?  17 A. Yeah. Initially I was hired to manage  18 litigation for the company and as time went on, I  19 took on other substantive responsibilities that  20 included -- I did some M&amp;A work, I managed the  21 company's employment law matters, I consulted on  22 product safety and liability issues; I was a member  23 of two of the company's -- the boards of the two of  24 the company's joint venture partnerships and other  25 duties as assigned.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 57</p> <p>1 A. Well, it was a large company. We had a  2 lot of outside counsel. Do you mean outside counsel  3 for corporate matters?  4 Q. Yes.  5 A. Orrick Herrington.  6 Q. While you were at Varian, what department  7 of the company accounted for stock options, to your  8 knowledge?  9 A. What department?  10 Q. Yes. Was there a department of the  11 company that was responsible for the accounting  12 of stock options?  13 A. For the accounting of stock options.  14 Well, presumably the accounting function. I don't  15 know.  16 Q. It's not something that you ever had  17 occasion to inquire as to?  18 A. No.  19 Q. Is that right?  20 A. Correct.  21 Q. From your perspective, you received stock  22 option awards; is that correct?  23 A. Yes. You've asked me that three times.  24 Yes.  25 Q. And did you have occasion to exercise and</p>

15 (Pages 54 to 57)

Nichols, Stuart J. Esq.

1/27/2008

<p>1 sell the options in Varian?</p> <p>2 A. Yes, I did.</p> <p>3 Q. When did you leave Varian?</p> <p>4 A. 1995.</p> <p>5 Q. Who did you next join?</p> <p>6 A. Samsung Semiconductor, Inc.</p> <p>7 Q. And where was the company's office base</p> <p>8 that you joined?</p> <p>9 A. San Jose, California.</p> <p>10 Q. What was your title there?</p> <p>11 A. General Counsel.</p> <p>12 Q. Was that your first general counsel</p> <p>13 position?</p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 Q. Generally what was your -- what were your</p> <p>16 responsibilities?</p> <p>17 A. I did a fair amount of commercial</p> <p>18 transactions; both on the sales and supply side.</p> <p>19 I did a fair amount of licensing of intellectual</p> <p>20 property, handled employment law issues. We had</p> <p>21 some strategic partnership deals that I was involved</p> <p>22 in and we did some acquisitions that I was involved</p> <p>23 in.</p> <p>24 Q. Did your job functions at all entail</p> <p>25 counseling with respect to the company's stock</p>	Page 58	<p>1 public.</p> <p>2 Q. They were public.</p> <p>3 And what was your title and function</p> <p>4 there?</p> <p>5 A. I was general counsel there as well, and</p> <p>6 my function was, you know, to handle whatever legal</p> <p>7 issues arose from the company.</p> <p>8 At that time Phoenix was a licensor of</p> <p>9 software to the PC industry as well as we had a</p> <p>10 division where we licensed intellectual property</p> <p>11 used in the development and design of semiconductor</p> <p>12 devices.</p> <p>13 Q. Did Phoenix Technologies use options as</p> <p>14 compensation for its employees?</p> <p>15 A. Phoenix had options, yes.</p> <p>16 Q. And did part of your responsibilities</p> <p>17 entail counseling with respect to options?</p> <p>18 A. No.</p> <p>19 Q. Did you personally receive options --</p> <p>20 A. Yes.</p> <p>21 Q. -- at Phoenix?</p> <p>22 And did you receive them on a regular</p> <p>23 basis while you were there? "Regular" being, you</p> <p>24 know, at least annually.</p> <p>25 A. Yeah. I believe I received a grant after</p>	Page 60
<p>1 options?</p> <p>2 A. Well, that assumes that the company had</p> <p>3 stock options.</p> <p>4 Q. It does indeed. Let me back up.</p> <p>5 Did Samsung use stock options as</p> <p>6 compensation for its employees?</p> <p>7 A. No.</p> <p>8 Q. You received no stock options when you</p> <p>9 were at Samsung; is that right?</p> <p>10 A. That's correct.</p> <p>11 Q. When did you leave Samsung?</p> <p>12 A. Now we're up to I think it was early</p> <p>13 to mid '98. No, no, no. I'm sorry. '97.</p> <p>14 Q. Okay. Sometime in 1997?</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 Q. And why did you leave Samsung?</p> <p>17 A. I'm sorry. Why?</p> <p>18 Q. Yes. Generally.</p> <p>19 A. Better opportunity.</p> <p>20 Q. All right. And who did you join?</p> <p>21 A. Phoenix Technologies Limited.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. Where were they based?</p> <p>23 A. San Jose, California.</p> <p>24 Q. Were they public or private?</p> <p>25 A. Public. Or I should say: Yes, they were</p>	Page 59	<p>1 my first year. I'm not 100 percent certain of that,</p> <p>2 but I believe I did.</p> <p>3 Q. Did you have an opportunity to generally</p> <p>4 observe how options were granted at Phoenix</p> <p>5 Technologies?</p> <p>6 A. No.</p> <p>7 Q. Did Phoenix Technologies use any sort of</p> <p>8 pooling system to allocate options?</p> <p>9 A. I don't know.</p> <p>10 Q. Okay. Were you able to observe what</p> <p>11 department at the company was responsible for</p> <p>12 accounting for option grants at Phoenix</p> <p>13 Technologies?</p> <p>14 A. Same answer as at Varian: I don't know</p> <p>15 from personal knowledge. Again, I would presume</p> <p>16 it was the accounting department.</p> <p>17 Q. Okay. What was your next employment?</p> <p>18 A. KLA-Tencor Corporation.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. And how did you become aware of the</p> <p>20 KLA-Tencor opportunity?</p> <p>21 A. I was told of the opportunity by a partner</p> <p>22 at Wilson Sonsini named Judy O'Brien.</p> <p>23 Q. How did you know Miss O'Brien?</p> <p>24 A. She was the corporate secretary to another</p> <p>25 company that I was considering going to so I was</p>	Page 61

16 (Pages 58 to 61)

Nichols, Stuart J. Esq.

1/27/2008

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 62</p> <p>1 interviewing her for one job and she told me about a 2 different job. 3 Q. Okay. And did you decide to interview for 4 the KLA-Tencor job? 5 A. Yes. 6 Q. By the way, I may refer to KLA-Tencor 7 Corporation as "KLA-Tencor" or simply "KLA" for 8 short. And when I say "KLA," I mean KLA-Tencor 9 Corporation. Can we have that understanding? 10 A. Yes, we can. 11 Q. All right. So who interviewed you at KLA? 12 A. Ken Levy, Ken Schroeder, and John Kispert. 13 MR. BELNICK: Shirli, with apologies. May 14 we take a break, a personal order break? 15 MS. WEISS: Absolutely. And, in fact, 16 please do interrupt me. I have a tendency not to 17 remember to take breaks. So by all means. I see it 18 is 10:56. Why don't we take a 10-minute break. 19 MR. BELNICK: Thank you. 20 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Off the record. The 21 time is 10:55 a.m. 22 (Off the record.) 23 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the 24 record. The time is 11:06 a.m. 25 BY MS. WEISS:</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 64</p> <p>1 Q. Okay. And did the company make you an 2 offer? 3 A. Yes. 4 Q. And who did you negotiate the terms of 5 your employment with? 6 A. Mr. Boehlke. 7 Q. And did the terms of your offer include an 8 award of options? 9 A. Yes. 10 Q. And what did you -- did you negotiate 11 back and forth with Mr. Boehlke in terms of your 12 employment or did you simply take what he offered 13 you? 14 A. I attempted to negotiate but ultimately 15 took what he offered me. 16 Q. Okay. And was it Mr. Boehlke who set your 17 salary compensation -- 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. -- is that your understanding? 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. All right. And did he also set the number 22 of options you would get when you joined the 23 company? 24 A. So far as I know. 25 Q. And do you recall what the terms were, as</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 63</p> <p>1 Q. Mr. Nichols, I believe I asked you who 2 interviewed you before you were hired by KLA and I 3 think that you began to tell me. And I wrote down 4 Mr. Schroeder, Mr. Kispert and Mr. Levy. Did I get 5 that right? 6 A. Yes. And then one other person, Bob 7 Boehlke, B-o-e-h-l-k-e, I believe is how it's 8 spelled. 9 Q. Okay. And who did you understand that you 10 would be reporting to if you took the position? 11 A. Mr. Boehlke. 12 Q. And who was Mr. Boehlke? 13 A. He was then the CFO. 14 Q. And that's the Chief Financial Officer? 15 A. That's correct. 16 Q. And who was Mr. Kispert at that time? 17 A. Do you mean what was his title? 18 Q. Yes. 19 A. Vice President of Finance. 20 Q. And Mr. Schroeder, what was his title at 21 that time? 22 A. Chief Executive Officer. 23 Q. And Mr. Levy, who was he? 24 A. At that time I believe he was the Chairman 25 of the Board of Directors.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 65</p> <p>1 you sit there? 2 A. No. 3 MS. WEISS: Could you hear me okay? 4 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: I was hearing you well 5 enough. 6 MS. WEISS: What number are we up to now? 7 DEPOSITION REPORTER: 50. 8 MS. WEISS: 50, 5-0? 9 DEPOSITION REPORTER: Correct. 10 MS. WEISS: We will have marked next in 11 order Exhibit 50. 12 (Whereupon, Exhibit 50 was marked 13 for identification.) 14 MS. WEISS: This will be 51 (indicating). 15 (Whereupon, Exhibit 51 was marked 16 for identification.) 17 MS. WEISS: This will be 52 (indicating). 18 (Whereupon, Exhibit 52 was marked 19 for identification.) 20 MS. WEISS: This will be 53 (indicating). 21 (Whereupon, Exhibit 53 was marked 22 for identification.) 23 BY MS. WEISS: 24 Q. All right. Mr. Nichols, turning your 25 attention to Exhibit 52. Exhibit 52 appears to the</p>

17 (Pages 62 to 65)

Nichols, Stuart J. Esq.

1/27/2008

<p>1 a redlined draft dated October 7, 1999, addressed to  2 yourself, Stuart J. Nichols, and it is unsigned. It  3 has the typewritten signature of Robert J. Boehlke,  4 Executive Vice President, Chief Financial Officer.  5 It's not on company stationery.</p> <p>6 Can you identify Exhibit 52, sir?</p> <p>7 A. How would you like me to identify it?</p> <p>8 Q. Can you tell me what it is?</p> <p>9 A. It appears to be a markup of an offer  10 letter to me from the company containing the  11 proposed terms of my employment.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. And so did you receive an unsigned  13 offer letter and were invited to mark it up for  14 Mr. Boehlke and send it back? Do you recall?</p> <p>15 A. I don't recall. I strongly suspect that  16 I was not invited to mark it up but just did so  17 anyway.</p> <p>18 Q. All right. And the black lining and the  19 deletions on Exhibit 52, are those your negotiations  20 or proposed markups of the contract?</p> <p>21 A. Yes, they appear to be.</p> <p>22 Q. Did anybody else mark this document up?</p> <p>23 A. No.</p> <p>24 Q. Were you advised by counsel, by the way,  25 when you joined the company?</p>	<p>Page 66</p> <p>1 Q. Paragraph 3 states, "Hiring bonus. We  2 had talked about the losses I will incur by not  3 completing the offer period for Phoenix ESPP  4 (conservatively, \$2,000.)"  5 Do you see that?</p> <p>6 A. Yeah.</p> <p>7 Q. Does "Phoenix ESPP" stand for Employee  8 Stock Purchase Plan?</p> <p>9 A. Yes.</p> <p>10 Q. And were you communicating to Mr. Boehlke  11 that by taking employment at KLA, you would be  12 incurring a loss by not receiving a benefit from  13 the Employee Stock Purchase Plan at Phoenix, your  14 current employment? Is that what you were  15 communicating?</p> <p>16 A. Well, I wouldn't put it exactly that way.  17 I would not have received the benefit, that's  18 correct.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. And you go on to state, "In  20 addition, there are some matching 401(k) dollars  21 (also roughly \$2,000) and the value of unvested 'in  22 the money' options."</p> <p>23 What were you referring to when you  24 were referred to "the value of the unvested 'in  25 the money' options" in your discussions with</p>
<p>1 A. No.</p> <p>2 Q. And so your effort was to negotiate the  3 terms of your contract in your favor. Was that your  4 effort on Exhibit 52?</p> <p>5 A. Yes.</p> <p>6 Q. If you take a look at Exhibit 50.  7 Exhibit 50 appears to reflect an email  8 from yourself dated October 12th, 1999, to Bob  9 Boehlke. The subject is "Revised offer letter," and  10 it starts off, "Bob, greetings from Massachusetts.  11 Attached is a marked up version of your offer  12 letter. My changes are noted in revision format.  13 The notable changes are," and then there's a summary  14 of the changes.</p> <p>15 So did you send this email to Mr. Boehlke  16 as part of the negotiation of the terms of your  17 employment with KLA?</p> <p>18 A. Presumably, yeah. I don't have a specific  19 memory of writing this, and I haven't -- this is the  20 first time I've seen it since I presumably sent it.  21 But, yeah, that's what it appears to be.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. What did you understand --  23 what were you communicating in paragraph 3 to  24 Mr. Boehlke?</p> <p>25 A. What exactly do you mean?</p>	<p>Page 67</p> <p>1 Mr. Boehlke?</p> <p>2 A. I'm referring to the stock options that I  3 held in Phoenix Technology stock where the exercise  4 price was less than the current market price.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay. And were you asking him to do  6 something with respect to the value of the unvested  7 in the money options as part of your employment?</p> <p>8 A. Well, yes. I was asking for a hiring  9 bonus in recognition of what I would be forgiving,  10 foregoing.</p> <p>11 Q. All right. And do you know if you got  12 that, what you were requesting?</p> <p>13 A. Well, you'd have to look at the paper  14 trail here. I truly don't remember.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. Let's look at Exhibit 51.</p> <p>16 That looks to me like it was the final  17 version of your offer, but you tell me. Exhibit 51  18 is a letter dated October 18th, 1999. It's  19 addressed to yourself. It appears to bear the  20 signature of Mr. Boehlke, and then below that  21 there's the terminology "Acceptance and  22 Acknowledgement," and then there's what appears  23 to be your signature.</p> <p>24 Would you look at Exhibit 51 and tell me  25 if that's your signature on the second page under</p>

18 (Pages 66 to 69)

Nichols, Stuart J. Esq.

1/27/2008

<p>1 "Acceptance and Acknowledgement."</p> <p>2 A. Yes, it is.</p> <p>3 Q. All right. And so his recommendation --</p> <p>4 well, his statement was that you would be receiving</p> <p>5 the salary that you requested in your markup; is</p> <p>6 that correct?</p> <p>7 A. The salary, yes.</p> <p>8 Q. And in addition, that you would be</p> <p>9 receiving 20,000 shares of -- an option to purchase</p> <p>10 20,000 shares of KLA-Tencor stock --</p> <p>11 A. That's correct.</p> <p>12 Q. -- referenced in that first paragraph</p> <p>13 under "Salary."</p> <p>14 Do you see that?</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 Q. All right. And I believe you identified</p> <p>17 your signature on the second page. And then the</p> <p>18 date October 25th, 1999.</p> <p>19 Is that your handwriting?</p> <p>20 A. Yes.</p> <p>21 Q. And up above where the arbitration clause</p> <p>22 is crossed out and there appears to be initials, are</p> <p>23 those your initials?</p> <p>24 A. Yes.</p> <p>25 Q. And you crossed out that arbitration</p>	<p>Page 70</p> <p>1 between Phoenix and KLA such that I would show --</p> <p>2 I went pretty much every day I think to both</p> <p>3 locations.</p> <p>4 Q. Okay. So you continued at Phoenix and you</p> <p>5 also started work for KLA. Would that be correct?</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. And you were paid from day 1; is that</p> <p>8 right?</p> <p>9 A. Yes, that's my recollection.</p> <p>10 Q. And where were you "housed,"</p> <p>11 quote-unquote, in the company?</p> <p>12 A. Do you mean where was my office?</p> <p>13 Q. Where was your office? I understand it</p> <p>14 had more than one building.</p> <p>15 A. At this stage I was lo- -- my office was</p> <p>16 located in the building referred to as "Building A."</p> <p>17 Q. Okay.</p> <p>18 A. At 160 Rio Robles.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. All right. Building A. And which</p> <p>20 floor were you on?</p> <p>21 A. The 2nd floor.</p> <p>22 Q. Where was Mr. Boehlke's office in relation</p> <p>23 to your office?</p> <p>24 A. In that same suite; 50 feet from mine.</p> <p>25 Q. And it was essentially a suite where</p>
<p>1 clause; is that right?</p> <p>2 A. Yes.</p> <p>3 Q. All right. And then below where it says</p> <p>4 "Start date," it says "TBD." Does that stand for to</p> <p>5 be decided?</p> <p>6 A. Or determined; yeah.</p> <p>7 Q. To be determined, okay.</p> <p>8 And then the "(late November)." Do you</p> <p>9 see that?</p> <p>10 A. Uh-huh, yes.</p> <p>11 Q. All right. And did you write that in?</p> <p>12 A. That appears to be my handwriting, yes.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. And did you start in approximately</p> <p>14 late November of 1999?</p> <p>15 A. No. I started -- immediately upon signing</p> <p>16 the agreement I started doing tasks for KLA.</p> <p>17 Q. Okay. When you say "doing tasks," were</p> <p>18 you still physically located at Phoenix or did you</p> <p>19 actually move into an office at KLA?</p> <p>20 A. Well, at this point right after I signed</p> <p>21 the offer letter -- and actually, it may have even</p> <p>22 been before I signed the offer letter -- there were</p> <p>23 things that I was getting involved in. And I had</p> <p>24 an arrangement with Bob Boehlke that I would</p> <p>25 essentially split my time for a period of time</p>	<p>Page 71</p> <p>1 the executives had their offices. Would that be</p> <p>2 correct?</p> <p>3 A. Yes.</p> <p>4 Q. All right. And you had the title of --</p> <p>5 when you started you had what title?</p> <p>6 A. Vice President, General Counsel.</p> <p>7 Q. Were you also a corporate secretary right</p> <p>8 from the day you started, or do you remember?</p> <p>9 A. I never was corporate secretary.</p> <p>10 Q. All right. And then just for purposes</p> <p>11 of identification, I have a new hire form that's</p> <p>12 Exhibit 53. What is a new hire form at the company?</p> <p>13 What was a new hire form? What was your</p> <p>14 understanding of the function of the form?</p> <p>15 A. It is the form that people complete when</p> <p>16 they commence their employment.</p> <p>17 Q. Okay. And is it a form that you receive</p> <p>18 from the human resources department?</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 Q. And down below it appears to have your</p> <p>21 signature and the date 10/25/99.</p> <p>22 Do you see that?</p> <p>23 A. Yes.</p> <p>24 Q. And is that your signature and did you</p> <p>25 date it that date?</p>

19 (Pages 70 to 73)

Nichols, Stuart J. Esq.

1/27/2008

Page 74	Page 76
1 A. Yes. 2 Q. And next to that it's human resources. Do 3 you recognize that signature? 4 A. Yes. 5 Q. Whose is that? 6 A. It's Aparjo Dehal. I don't know if I'm 7 pronouncing that correctly. 8 Q. Was that a person in human resources? 9 A. Yes. 10 Q. And what did you understand -- as you came 11 aboard KLA-Tencor, what did you understand from your 12 discussions with Mr. Boehlke or others what your job 13 responsibilities were going to be? 14 A. Ultimately responsible for the legal 15 affairs of the company. 16 Q. What does that mean? 17 A. That means anything from commercial 18 transactions, employment advice, M&A, management of 19 litigation, some supervision of the incumbent patent 20 lawyer and so forth. 21 Q. What was your function with respect to SEC 22 filings? As you walked in the door, what did you 23 think your function was? 24 A. To review and, you know, provide input 25 from a legal perspective.	1 A. Are you asking me whether at all times I 2 had an assistant or a secretary? 3 Q. When you came aboard. 4 A. Oh, yeah. 5 Q. Okay. And that person left? 6 A. Yes. 7 Q. And do you remember the name of the person 8 who followed her in terms of those tasks? 9 A. Yeah. So then I had someone who was my 10 assistant for the first half, approximately, of 11 2000. 12 Q. What was her name or his name? 13 A. Her name was Sylvia Taheri, T-a-h-e-r-i. 14 "Sylvia" spelled with a "y," I believe. 15 Q. And your recollection is she stayed the 16 first half of 2000; is that right? 17 A. Yes. 18 Q. And then did someone follow her? 19 A. Yes. 20 Q. Who was that person? 21 A. Her name is Kery Bird, K-e-r-y, B-i-r-d. 22 Q. How long did Miss Bird stay as your 23 assistant? 24 A. From then until I left the company. 25 Q. And were the duties of Miss Bird and
Page 75	Page 77
1 Q. Was part of your function going to be 2 advising the board? 3 A. Yes. 4 Q. And was part of your function going to be 5 advising the executive officers? 6 A. Yes. 7 Q. And was part of your function going to 8 be advising nonexecutive officers to the extent you 9 were called upon to do so at KLA? 10 A. Yes. 11 Q. Did you have -- as you came in, did you 12 have a staff at all? 13 A. I had an administrative assistant and a 14 patent lawyer, and then I had a non -- a person who 15 was not part of the legal department who was also 16 reporting to me. 17 Q. What was the patent lawyer's name? 18 A. Kevin McAndrews. 19 Q. And what was your administrative 20 assistant's name? 21 A. She left shortly after I arrived and I 22 don't remember her name. 23 Q. Okay. Did someone serve as your secretary 24 or assistant, whatever the terminology was, at KLA 25 while you were there?	1 Sylvia -- I don't know how to pronounce her last 2 name -- essentially secretarial duties? 3 A. Yes. 4 Q. Did you have anyone that seemed to have 5 the duties of a paralegal there at KLA? 6 A. Not at that time. Eventually there was a 7 patent paralegal that we hired. 8 Q. What was that person's name? 9 A. Well, there were a couple. The first 10 one was named Heidi, H-e-i-d-i, I think, Opstedahl 11 (phonetic), I think is her last name, and I can't 12 even begin to try to spell that. And then she was 13 followed by another patent paralegal named Odette, 14 O-d-e-t-t-e, Devera, D-e-v-e-r-a. 15 Q. Okay. Was there anyone on the corporate 16 side who assisted from a legal standpoint? Any 17 junior attorney or -- 18 A. What do you mean when you say "on the 19 corporate side"? 20 Q. In other words, all the other duties that 21 you described; commercial transactions, M&A. 22 A. Shortly after I joined the company I hired 23 a contract lawyer to handle transactional matters. 24 Her name was Corinne Tomeo, C-o-r-i-n-n-e, "Tomeo," 25 is spelled T-o-m-i-e-o -- no, T-o-m- -- I don't

20 (Pages 74 to 77)

Nichols, Stuart J. Esq.

1/27/2008

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 78</p> <p>1 know, T-o-m-e-o.</p> <p>2 Q. How long did she stay?</p> <p>3 A. A few months is all. Not very long.</p> <p>4 Q. Okay. Anybody else that served more on</p> <p>5 the transaction or corporate side, not IP?</p> <p>6 A. After Corinne left I hired someone to take</p> <p>7 over her responsibilities as a payrolled employee.</p> <p>8 Q. Okay. What was that person's name?</p> <p>9 A. Kim Jackson.</p> <p>10 Q. Did Miss Jackson have a law degree?</p> <p>11 A. Yeah. She still does, so far as I know.</p> <p>12 Q. What did Miss Jackson do for you?</p> <p>13 A. General -- really in the beginning it was</p> <p>14 mostly commercial transactions supporting the sales</p> <p>15 and procurement organizations. And as time went</p> <p>16 on, she had increasing responsibility over a broad</p> <p>17 segment of the issues that we dealt with.</p> <p>18 Q. Did Miss Jackson ever attend Compensation</p> <p>19 Committee meetings?</p> <p>20 A. No.</p> <p>21 Q. Did Miss Jackson ever attend board</p> <p>22 meetings?</p> <p>23 A. No.</p> <p>24 Q. Did Miss Jackson prepare any of the</p> <p>25 documentation that you interacted with with respect</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 80</p> <p>1 A. She was mostly supporting the company's</p> <p>2 procurement organization but also working on</p> <p>3 sales-related transactions as well.</p> <p>4 Q. Okay. Did she ever attend any</p> <p>5 Compensation Committee meetings?</p> <p>6 A. No.</p> <p>7 Q. Board meetings?</p> <p>8 A. No.</p> <p>9 Q. Did she help you compile documentation for</p> <p>10 either of those two types of meetings?</p> <p>11 A. No.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. Anyone else in the general category</p> <p>13 that I mentioned?</p> <p>14 A. If your general category includes</p> <p>15 transactional work?</p> <p>16 Q. Yes, transactional work and corporate and</p> <p>17 M&amp;A.</p> <p>18 A. There was -- when I joined the company</p> <p>19 there was a lawyer in the sales organization that</p> <p>20 was not part of legal and I -- he eventually</p> <p>21 transferred over into the legal department. His</p> <p>22 responsibility was to support the sales organization</p> <p>23 on transactional matters.</p> <p>24 Q. And his name was?</p> <p>25 A. Alex, A-l-e-x, Yuan, Y-u-a-n.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 79</p> <p>1 to either the Compensation Committee or the board?</p> <p>2 A. I think that in the latter portion, and by</p> <p>3 that I mean, you know, the last 12 months or so of</p> <p>4 my tenure at KLA, she helped me with some matters</p> <p>5 relating to the Compensation Committee.</p> <p>6 Q. Is Miss Jackson still employed by KLA?</p> <p>7 A. No.</p> <p>8 Q. Where does she live?</p> <p>9 A. Where does she live? I think in Palo</p> <p>10 Alto, California.</p> <p>11 Q. Do you know if "Jackson" is her married</p> <p>12 name?</p> <p>13 A. Given that she's not married, I don't</p> <p>14 think it is.</p> <p>15 Q. I think that means no.</p> <p>16 Okay. Anyone else that you can identify</p> <p>17 that helped you on the corporate or transaction</p> <p>18 side? I have Miss Jackson and Corinne Tomeo.</p> <p>19 Anyone else that filled that role at any time</p> <p>20 while you were there?</p> <p>21 A. For the last two years or so of my tenure</p> <p>22 at KLA there was a transactional attorney that</p> <p>23 worked as a contractor for the company, and her</p> <p>24 name is Teri Little, L-i-t-t-l-e, T-e-r-i.</p> <p>25 Q. And she worked as what again, did you say?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 81</p> <p>1 Q. Y-u-a-n. Okay.</p> <p>2 Was there any assistant that you had</p> <p>3 during your tenure -- let's put aside Miss Jackson;</p> <p>4 you identified her -- that assisted you in</p> <p>5 connection with anything having to do with</p> <p>6 compensation?</p> <p>7 A. No.</p> <p>8 Q. When you needed to prepare materials for</p> <p>9 any Compensation Committee meeting or board meeting,</p> <p>10 who did you look to to assist you?</p> <p>11 A. To the extent that I looked for</p> <p>12 assistance, it would typically have been outside</p> <p>13 counsel, Bret DiMarco.</p> <p>14 Q. Okay. Not Miss Bird or Sylvia?</p> <p>15 A. No. B-r-e-t, D-i-M-a-r-c-o.</p> <p>16 MS. WEISS: Okay. Let's mark Exhibit 54.</p> <p>17 (Whereupon, Exhibit 54 was marked</p> <p>18 for identification.)</p> <p>19 BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>20 Q. Okay. Exhibit 54 is a document that is</p> <p>21 Bates stamped MLB/KLA-SEC 00011067 to 11072. It's</p> <p>22 a document that was received from the SEC in</p> <p>23 production in this litigation. It's entitled</p> <p>24 "Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Directors</p> <p>25 of KLA-Tencor Corporation," dated November 16th,</p>

21 (Pages 78 to 81)

Nichols, Stuart J. Esq.

1/27/2008

<p>1 1999.</p> <p>2 Would you make take a moment, sir, and</p> <p>3 review it.</p> <p>4 MR. BELNICK: Shirli, may I remark we do</p> <p>5 have that document, but it doesn't bear the Bates</p> <p>6 numbers you have.</p> <p>7 MS. WEISS: Well, that's interesting.</p> <p>8 MR. FICKES: The copy you gave us has the</p> <p>9 Bates number of KLS-SEC002735 --</p> <p>10 MR. BELNICK: 002735 through 002739,</p> <p>11 prefaced by the initials KLS-SEC.</p> <p>12 MS. WEISS: Okay. And why don't we use</p> <p>13 the numbers that you just articulated. I must have</p> <p>14 a different compilation set.</p> <p>15 BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>16 Q. Sir, would you take a moment to review</p> <p>17 Exhibit 54 and tell me when you've done that.</p> <p>18 A. Okay. I've done that.</p> <p>19 Q. All right. Can you identify Exhibit 54?</p> <p>20 A. Yeah. These are minutes of a board</p> <p>21 meeting of KLA-Tencor Corporation for a meeting</p> <p>22 held November 16 of 1999.</p> <p>23 Q. All right. Thank you.</p> <p>24 And in the second last page of the</p> <p>25 compilation there appears to be on the minutes a</p>	<p>Page 82</p> <p>1 Stu Nichols, who was elected Vice president and</p> <p>2 General Counsel of the Company at the meeting and</p> <p>3 Judith M. O'Brien from Wilson Sonsini Goodrich &amp;</p> <p>4 Rosati, the Company's outside counsel." And then</p> <p>5 it says, "Mr. Levy acted as Chairman and led the</p> <p>6 meeting; Mrs. O'Brien acted as Secretary and kept</p> <p>7 the minutes."</p> <p>8 Do you see that, sir?</p> <p>9 A. Yes.</p> <p>10 Q. All right. Does that refresh your memory</p> <p>11 that Miss O'Brien kept the minutes but then you</p> <p>12 signed them as present at the meeting and general</p> <p>13 counsel?</p> <p>14 A. No, it doesn't refresh my memory in that</p> <p>15 regard. I mean, I see what's written here and I</p> <p>16 don't have any reason to doubt it, but I just don't</p> <p>17 have a memory of that.</p> <p>18 Q. All right. And were minutes generally</p> <p>19 taken at board of directors meetings that you</p> <p>20 attended at KLA-Tencor?</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 Q. And some of those minutes were taken by</p> <p>23 you as general counsel. Would that be a correct</p> <p>24 general statement?</p> <p>25 A. Yes.</p>
<p>1 signature block for yourself as Vice President,</p> <p>2 General Counsel. Is that your signature on the</p> <p>3 minutes?</p> <p>4 A. Yes.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay. And did you in fact attend the</p> <p>6 meeting referenced by the document?</p> <p>7 A. It appears that I did, yes.</p> <p>8 Q. Do you know if you prepared the notes from</p> <p>9 which the typewritten minutes were prepared?</p> <p>10 A. No, I don't recall. I don't know.</p> <p>11 Q. Okay. Let's go through the minutes.</p> <p>12 Okay. Under "Attendance and Quorum" the paragraph</p> <p>13 states, "Present and at the meeting were chairman</p> <p>14 Kenneth Levy and Directors James W. Bagley, Leo J.</p> <p>15 Chamberlain, Richard J. Elkus, Dag Tellefsen, Jon D.</p> <p>16 Tompkins, Dean O. Morton, Samuel Rubinovitz, Kenneth</p> <p>17 L. Schroeder and Lida Urbanek, constituting a</p> <p>18 quorum. Director Edward W. Barnholt was absent."</p> <p>19 Do you see that?</p> <p>20 A. Yes.</p> <p>21 Q. And do you recall the names of those</p> <p>22 people as people who served as members of the</p> <p>23 board of directors of KLA-Tencor at the time?</p> <p>24 A. Yes.</p> <p>25 Q. Then it states, "Also present were</p>	<p>Page 83</p> <p>1 Q. And when you took the minutes for the</p> <p>2 company, you did your best to accurately reflect the</p> <p>3 information that was shown in the minutes; is that</p> <p>4 correct?</p> <p>5 A. Yes.</p> <p>6 Q. And it's also correct that the minutes are</p> <p>7 not a transcript of what occurred at the meetings;</p> <p>8 correct?</p> <p>9 A. Correct.</p> <p>10 Q. And there was general discussion among</p> <p>11 the participants that might not be reflected in the</p> <p>12 minutes; is that correct?</p> <p>13 A. That's correct.</p> <p>14 Q. And as far as you know, what is stated in</p> <p>15 the minutes, however, are statements of occurrences</p> <p>16 and statements made that are reflected in the</p> <p>17 minutes that you took. Would that be correct?</p> <p>18 A. You lost me on that question. Sorry.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. To the extent that you took the</p> <p>20 minutes of a corporation of KLA-Tencor and signed</p> <p>21 the minutes, the statements made in the minutes, to</p> <p>22 the best of your knowledge, would be the reflection</p> <p>23 of what actually occurred or what was said that is</p> <p>24 represented in the minutes as a general rule. Would</p> <p>25 that be correct?</p>

22 (Pages 82 to 85)

Nichols, Stuart J. Esq.

1/27/2008

Page 86	Page 88
<p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. And it was your intention to accurately</p> <p>3 reflect what occurred at the meeting; correct?</p> <p>4 A. Yes.</p> <p>5 Q. Do you recall, sir, if the November 16th,</p> <p>6 1999, meeting of the board is the first meeting of</p> <p>7 KLA-Tencor that you attended?</p> <p>8 A. Yes, it would have been the first meeting</p> <p>9 that I attended.</p> <p>10 Q. All right. Under "Election of Officers"</p> <p>11 it shows, "Resolved: That the Board approved the</p> <p>12 election of officers as attached hereto as Exhibit A</p> <p>13 to serve at the discretion of the Board until their</p> <p>14 successors are duly appointed and qualified." And</p> <p>15 then attached on the last page is a list of</p> <p>16 officers.</p> <p>17 Would you review that list and tell me if</p> <p>18 it comports with your recollection of who served as</p> <p>19 officers at that time period for KLA-Tencor.</p> <p>20 A. Yes. Yes.</p> <p>21 Q. Okay. Anything that you recognize that</p> <p>22 looks to you to be out of order?</p> <p>23 A. Well, I hesitated a moment because I don't</p> <p>24 see here a reference to a VP of HR, but at that time</p> <p>25 I believe that our VP of HR was not a corporate</p>	<p>1 Strategic Business Development.</p> <p>2 Do you see that?</p> <p>3 A. Yes.</p> <p>4 Q. Did he serve in any other capacity?</p> <p>5 A. Yeah. You know, I believe at this time</p> <p>6 Art Schnitzer was the VP of HR, not the VP of</p> <p>7 Strategic Business Development. So that appears</p> <p>8 to be an error.</p> <p>9 Q. All right. And then there's Samuel H.</p> <p>10 Harrell, Ph.D., Senior Vice President of Strategic</p> <p>11 Business Development; is that correct?</p> <p>12 A. Yes, that's correct.</p> <p>13 Q. All right. Richard P. Wallace was Group</p> <p>14 Vice President of Lithography and Films.</p> <p>15 Do you see that?</p> <p>16 A. Yes.</p> <p>17 Q. Is that the same Richard Wallace that's</p> <p>18 president today?</p> <p>19 A. John Kispert is president; Rick Wallace is</p> <p>20 the CEO.</p> <p>21 Q. All right. And Rick Wallace, who's the</p> <p>22 current CEO, is the same Richard Wallace that's</p> <p>23 referred to here?</p> <p>24 A. Yes.</p> <p>25 Q. All right. And then your title below that</p>
<p>1 officer. So, yeah, so this comports with my...</p> <p>2 Q. All right. And so then briefly Ken Levy</p> <p>3 was the Chairman of the Board at the time and</p> <p>4 Mr. Schroeder was the Chief Executive Officer</p> <p>5 and was also President --</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. -- is that your recollection?</p> <p>8 A. That's my collection.</p> <p>9 Q. And Mr. Dickerson, he was Chief Operating</p> <p>10 Officer at the time?</p> <p>11 A. Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. And Mr. Boehlke served as the Executive</p> <p>13 Vice President and Chief Financial Officer?</p> <p>14 A. Correct.</p> <p>15 Q. And Mr. Grady served as Executive Vice</p> <p>16 President of the Wafer Inspection Group?</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 Q. Mr. Neil Richardson, Ph.D., was Executive</p> <p>19 Vice President of the E-Beam Inspection and</p> <p>20 Meteorology [sic] Group; is that correct?</p> <p>21 A. Metrology, not meteorology.</p> <p>22 Q. Metrology Group; is that correct?</p> <p>23 A. Yes.</p> <p>24 Q. All right. And Arthur P. Schnitzer -- I</p> <p>25 got that right -- was Executive Vice President,</p>	<p>1 is described as Vice President, General Counsel and</p> <p>2 Assistant Secretary.</p> <p>3 Do you see that?</p> <p>4 A. Yes.</p> <p>5 Q. And what was your function as assistant</p> <p>6 secretary?</p> <p>7 A. To handle corporate governance matters,</p> <p>8 review and provide input on SEC filings, do board</p> <p>9 minutes, prepare the proxy, those sorts of things.</p> <p>10 Q. All right. And then John H. Kispert,</p> <p>11 Vice President, Finance and Accounting.</p> <p>12 Do you see that?</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 Q. What was his role at that time period,</p> <p>15 fall of 1999?</p> <p>16 A. He had all -- he had responsibility for</p> <p>17 all of the finance and accounting-related functions.</p> <p>18 In other words, they -- those functions reported to</p> <p>19 him at that time.</p> <p>20 Q. All right. And so to the extent that</p> <p>21 the company needed to account for its stock</p> <p>22 option awards, that would have been Mr. Kispert's</p> <p>23 responsibility; correct?</p> <p>24 A. Yes.</p> <p>25 Q. And under that is J. Dennis Fortino, Group</p>

23 (Pages 86 to 89)

Nichols, Stuart J. Esq.

1/27/2008

Page 90	Page 92
<p>1 Vice President, Reticle and Surfscan Group. Did I 2 get that right? 3 A. Yes, you did. 4 Q. All right. And then under that, Larry W. 5 Sonsini. And Mr. Sonsini was outside counsel; is 6 that correct? 7 A. That's correct. 8 Q. And he also served as the secretary of the 9 corporation; is that right? 10 A. Yes. 11 Q. And was Wilson Sonsini Goodrich &amp; Rosati 12 the outside corporate counsel company at that time? 13 A. One of them; yes. 14 Q. Okay. So we had marked a little bit 15 earlier your notebooks which I'm now going attempt 16 to identify for the record. Your notebooks are all 17 in front of you. 18 MR. BELNICK: If that's all you're going 19 it do, I don't mind if you go and I just hit the 20 bathroom so I don't bother everybody. 21 MS. WEISS: Everybody will keep an eye on 22 me for you. 23 MR. BELNICK: Okay. I trust you. 24 You're in good hands, Stu. 25 MS. WEISS: I did have a little list here</p>	<p>1 BY MS. WEISS: 2 Q. Could you identify Exhibit 41. 3 A. This appears to be a copy of my 4 composition notebook that I maintained both 5 during the latter portion of my tenure at Phoenix 6 Technologies as well as during the first few months 7 of my tenure at KLA-Tencor. 8 Q. All right. And the first date that is 9 referenced on the first written page is 8/23/99. 10 Do you see that? 11 A. Yes. 12 Q. And is the handwriting in this compilation 13 your handwriting? 14 A. Yes, it is. 15 Q. Okay. Could you tell me what you see as 16 the last date referenced in Exhibit 41. 17 A. It looks -- it appears that there is an 18 entry on June 22nd. 19 Q. Of 1999? 20 A. No. That would be 2000. 21 Q. No, that would be 2000, wouldn't it? 22 You said June 22nd, 2000. And what's the 23 Bates stamp, the last four digits of that entry? 24 A. The beginning of the entry is 2694. There 25 are some additional pages that don't appear to bear</p>
<p>1 at one point. There was a list of how many were 2 marked. Just bear with me for a second. 3 Here it is (indicating). All right. 4 BY MS. WEISS: 5 Q. Marked as Exhibit 41 is a copy of 6 a comp notebook and it bears Bates stamps 7 KT ACWP-PRIV00002541 through and including 2696. 8 The first page has the name "Stu Nichols" on it. 9 Sir, would you look at Exhibit 41 and 10 tell me if you can identify it. 11 A. Well, before we do that, the stack I have 12 here goes through 2691, not 2696, so I'm not quite 13 sure. 14 MR. HEMANN: Mine goes through 2696. 15 MR. FICKES: Mine does as well. 16 MS. WEISS: Okay. Well, that's not good. 17 Yours is not complete. 18 Do we have an extra one of that? 19 MR. HEMANN: He can borrow my copy. We'll 20 switch. 21 MS. WEISS: All right. At the break we'll 22 supplement, absolutely. 23 So, again, the compilation goes through 24 2696. I believe the witness has been provided with 25 a complete copy.</p>	<p>1 a date. 2 Q. Okay. Very good. 3 Turning your attention to what has -- what 4 has been marked as Exhibit 42. It would be Bates 5 stamped KT ACWP-PRIV00002697 through and including 6 the same prefixes, last four digits 2893. 7 Do your numbers match that? 8 A. Yes. 9 Q. Okay. That would be Exhibit 42. And 10 could you identify it for the record. 11 A. This appears to be a copy of a composition 12 notebook which I used while at KLA starting in June 13 of 2000. 14 Q. Okay. And the first date that's shown, I 15 think it is on the second page, is what? 16 A. June 26th of 2000. 17 Q. And the last date that is shown? 18 A. The last date that I see here is -- it 19 appears to be May 15, 2001. 20 Q. What's the Bates stamp, last four digits, 21 you're looking at? 22 A. 2889. 23 Q. Okay. 4/30/01. And then under that 24 what's the date that you see? 25 A. It appears to be 5/15.</p>

24 (Pages 90 to 93)

Nichols, Stuart J. Esq.

1/27/2008

		Page 94	Page 96
1	Q. And you infer that to be in 2001 --		
2	A. Correct.		
3	Q. -- right?		
4	MS. WEISS: Okay. Do you want to take --		
5	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Yeah, change the tape.		
6	MS. WEISS: We need to change the tape		
7	here so we'll take a minute.		
8	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Okay. We are going off		
9	the record.		
10	Here marks the end of videotape No. 1,		
11	Volume I, in the deposition of Stuart J. Nichols.		
12	(Off the record.)		
13	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the		
14	record.		
15	Here marks the beginning of videotape		
16	No. 2, Volume I, in the deposition of Stuart J.		
17	Nichols. The time is 11:53 a.m.		
18	BY MS. WEISS:		
19	Q. Mr. Nichols, I'm not sure if I asked you,		
20	but on Exhibit 42, is Exhibit 42 a collection of		
21	your notations made contemporaneously with the dates		
22	shown?		
23	A. Generally, yes.		
24	Q. Okay. And that's your handwriting that		
25	appears in the compilation?		
		Page 95	Page 97
1	A. Yes.		
2	Q. Okay. And then moving to Exhibit 43, the		
3	Bates stamp numbers of KT ACWP-PRIV00002894 to the		
4	last four digits 3047.		
5	Does that comport with your Exhibit 43?		
6	A. Yes.		
7	Q. Okay. And the front of the page says,		
8	"Computation book Stu Nichols," under that "May		
9	'01-April '02."		
10	Do you see that, sir?		
11	A. Yes.		
12	Q. Is that your handwriting?		
13	A. Yes.		
14	Q. All right. And then on the third page,		
15	the first entry, could you read that date.		
16	A. 5/22/01.		
17	Q. And is that in your handwriting?		
18	A. Yes.		
19	Q. And can you pick up on the last date entry		
20	in the compilation, please.		
21	A. The last date entry I see is on page 3041,		
22	and that is -- that page bears a date of 4/2/02.		
23	Q. Okay. And does the compilation contain		
24	your handwritten notes made contemporaneously with		
25	the events referenced?		

25 (Pages 94 to 97)

Nichols, Stuart J. Esq.

1/27/2008

Page 98	Page 100
<p>1 A. The first -- the first part of a date that  2 I see is on 3210, and the copy is such that the  3 first portion of the date does not appear, though  4 it's likely December 02 -- I'm sorry, December 13,  5 '02. The first full date appears on 3212, and that  6 is -- and that appears 2702 -- oh, I see -- okay.  7 The copy is such that the 1 doesn't  8 appear, but if I look at the next page, two pages  9 later, it appears there is -- the first full date of  10 the whole book, that's 12/17/02, which leads me to  11 believe that the two pages previous on 3212, that  12 the 1 somehow got cut off in the copying and so that  13 would be a date of 12/17/02.</p> <p>14 Q. Okay. Can you pick up a final date on the  15 compilation?</p> <p>16 A. 8/26/03.</p> <p>17 Q. Okay. Thank you.</p> <p>18 Exhibit 46 is computation book Bates  19 stamped KT ACWP-PRIV00003358 through and including,  20 same prefix, last four digits 3512.</p> <p>21 Do you see that?</p> <p>22 A. Yes.</p> <p>23 Q. The first page states "Stu Nichols  24 extension 2423," under that 8/28/03 to 4/27/04.</p> <p>25 Is that your handwriting, sir?</p>	<p>1 compilation?  2 A. 5/5/04.  3 Q. And the last date?  4 A. The last date that shows in this document  5 appears on page 36 -- 3655, and the date is  6 4/14/05.  7 Q. Okay. Does the compilation consist of  8 your handwritten notes created on or around the  9 event or conversation that you reference?  10 A. Generally, yes.  11 Q. Okay. Two more, sir.  12 Exhibit 48 is a compilation  13 of a computation notebook Bates stamped  14 KT ACWP-PRIV00003666 through and including the  15 same prefix, the last the four numbers 3818.  16 Do you see that?  17 A. Yes.  18 Q. The first page states "Stu Nichols  19 408-875-2423," and under that "April '05-April '06."  20 Is that your handwriting, sir?  21 A. Yes.  22 Q. Can you tell me the first date referenced  23 in the compilation?  24 A. The first date written in the compilation  25 is 4/28/05.</p>
<p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. Can you tell me what the first date is  3 that you pick up in the compilation?</p> <p>4 A. 8/28/03.</p> <p>5 Q. And the last date in the compilation?</p> <p>6 A. 6/9/04.</p> <p>7 Q. Okay. You had a brief opportunity to  8 review this book prior to the deposition. Does it  9 consist of your handwritten notes?</p> <p>10 A. Yes.</p> <p>11 Q. And were the notes generally made at  12 or around the time of the event or conversation  13 referenced?</p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 Q. Exhibit 47 is a computation book Bates  16 stamped KT ACWP-PRIV00003513 through 3665. Is that  17 correct, sir?</p> <p>18 A. Yes.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. The title is "Stu Nichols,  20 408-875" -- is that a 2 or a 1?</p> <p>21 A. 2. 2423.</p> <p>22 Q. -- "2423." And April 2004-April '05.  23 Is that your handwriting, sir?</p> <p>24 A. Yes.</p> <p>25 Q. What is the first date you see in the</p>	<p>1 Q. And the last date?  2 A. It appears to be May 17. There's no year,  3 but based on what's written on the cover page, that  4 would be '06.  5 Q. All right. Does Exhibit 48 contain your  6 handwritten notations, sir?  7 A. Yes.  8 Q. And were they made generally at or around  9 the time of the event or conversation referenced in  10 the notes?  11 A. Yes.  12 Q. Exhibit 49. Exhibit 49 -- excuse  13 me -- is a computation book Bates stamped  14 KT ACWP-PRIV00003819 through and including the  15 same prefix, 3855.  16 Do you see that, sir?  17 A. Yes.  18 Q. The title page "Computation Book Stu  19 Nichols 408-875-2423," and under that "April 21,  20 2006-August '06."  21 Do you see that?  22 A. Yes.  23 Q. Is that your handwriting?  24 A. Yes.  25 Q. What is the first date that is referenced</p>

26 (Pages 98 to 101)

Nichols, Stuart J. Esq.

1/27/2008

<p>1 in the compilation, sir?</p> <p>2 A. 4/21/06.</p> <p>3 Q. And what is the final date that's</p> <p>4 referenced in the compilation, sir?</p> <p>5 A. 5/12/06.</p> <p>6 Q. Okay. Thank you.</p> <p>7 Mr. Nichols, I'm going to ask you a few</p> <p>8 questions about your custom and practice in creating</p> <p>9 these notations and then we'll take a break for</p> <p>10 lunch.</p> <p>11 First of all, apart from the notebooks,</p> <p>12 with respect to your calendars, how did you keep</p> <p>13 a calendar during the time period that you were</p> <p>14 employed at KLA?</p> <p>15 A. Generally -- well, I believe exclusively</p> <p>16 I kept my calendar on Outlook.</p> <p>17 Q. Did you make your own entries?</p> <p>18 A. Occasionally, but not often.</p> <p>19 Q. Who made the entries on your behalf, if</p> <p>20 anybody?</p> <p>21 A. Kery Bird.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. And when she wasn't there, did</p> <p>23 the person who served in her function make those</p> <p>24 entries?</p> <p>25 A. Yeah. Or I would -- or I would do it.</p>	Page 102	<p>1 with the KLA options investigation or anything like</p> <p>2 that?</p> <p>3 A. No.</p> <p>4 Q. If that was done, someone else did it?</p> <p>5 A. Correct.</p> <p>6 Q. Okay. Could you first of all describe</p> <p>7 generally what was your custom and practice in terms</p> <p>8 of making entries in the computation books which are</p> <p>9 exhibits 41 through 49.</p> <p>10 A. Well, it varied a little bit over time so</p> <p>11 how would you like me to slice that up?</p> <p>12 Q. Start with the beginning and move forward.</p> <p>13 A. Yeah. So at the beginning I didn't always</p> <p>14 enter all of my notes in a composition book, and</p> <p>15 then over time I eventually -- when I would go to a</p> <p>16 meeting I would take my spiral notebook with me and</p> <p>17 would try to reflect all of my notes in those books.</p> <p>18 Q. So in the beginning were your notes taken</p> <p>19 in more than one place, for example?</p> <p>20 A. Yes.</p> <p>21 Q. All right. And with respect to the notes</p> <p>22 that were taken outside of the spiral notebooks, how</p> <p>23 did you keep those notes?</p> <p>24 A. I don't know that I did. I have no idea</p> <p>25 where those are.</p>	Page 104
<p>1 Q. Okay. Did you have anywhere else that you</p> <p>2 made a notation of a meeting that was upcoming?</p> <p>3 A. Do you mean a handwritten calendar that I</p> <p>4 carried around?</p> <p>5 Q. Yes. Did you ever have any handwritten</p> <p>6 calendars?</p> <p>7 A. Not that I recall. I may have at the</p> <p>8 very beginning at KLA, but I don't have a specific</p> <p>9 recollection of that.</p> <p>10 Q. Do you know whether or not your Outlook</p> <p>11 calendar entries for the time period that you were</p> <p>12 at KLA remained in the possession of KLA?</p> <p>13 A. Well, presumably.</p> <p>14 Q. Did you ever have occasion to go back and</p> <p>15 look through them for any reason?</p> <p>16 MR. BELNICK: When? Excuse me. Since he</p> <p>17 left KLA?</p> <p>18 MS. WEISS: Yes, thank you.</p> <p>19 THE WITNESS: No.</p> <p>20 BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>21 Q. No?</p> <p>22 A. I did not go back -- after I left KLA, I</p> <p>23 never went back and looked at my calendar.</p> <p>24 Q. So you were never asked to print out all</p> <p>25 your calendar entries, for example, in connection</p>	Page 103	<p>1 Q. So you might have left those in a variety</p> <p>2 of places and didn't necessarily retain them;</p> <p>3 correct?</p> <p>4 A. Correct.</p> <p>5 Q. There was no litigation pending at that</p> <p>6 time; correct?</p> <p>7 A. Correct.</p> <p>8 Q. All right. And so it would be a true</p> <p>9 statement to say that the notes reflected in</p> <p>10 exhibits 41 through 49 are not necessarily all of</p> <p>11 the notes that you took during the time period that</p> <p>12 you were at KLA; correct?</p> <p>13 A. That's correct.</p> <p>14 Q. And I've noticed in going through the</p> <p>15 notes that there are sometimes several week gaps</p> <p>16 between the calendar entries. So could you address</p> <p>17 that. What was the usual way that that occurred?</p> <p>18 A. Well, that would occur because I had gone</p> <p>19 to meetings with a notepad separate from my spiral</p> <p>20 notebook. It could have also been the case that I</p> <p>21 attended a series of meetings where the discussion</p> <p>22 wasn't something that I needed to make -- I felt I</p> <p>23 didn't need to make a written note of it for myself.</p> <p>24 Q. And I suppose it's true that you had</p> <p>25 conversations with people that are not necessarily</p>	Page 105

27 (Pages 102 to 105)

Nichols, Stuart J. Esq.

1/27/2008

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 106</p> <p>1 reflected in any notes; is that true?  2 A. Yes.  3 Q. And you attended meetings that you didn't  4 make any notes of. Would that be correct?  5 A. Correct.  6 Q. When you left KLA, do you know what became  7 of any of the notes that you had at KLA at the time  8 that you left their employ?  9 A. I'm not exactly sure what you're going  10 after here. Can you repeat the question?  11 Q. For example, sometimes when people exit,  12 they do exit interviews and they say, "All my notes  13 that I ever took at the company are," you know, "in  14 the bottom left-hand drawer here," and they point  15 them out. Did you have any debriefing session where  16 you pointed out where the notes were that you took  17 during the time that you were general counsel?  18 A. No. When I went to the company to clean  19 out my office, these notebooks were on my shelf and  20 I delivered them to KLA's outside firm.  21 Q. Okay. And the computer that had the  22 Outlook calendar entries, is that the same computer  23 that Skadden took custody of?  24 A. Well, yes. However, you have to recognize  25 that all that data is in Outlook and it's therefore</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 108</p> <p>1 time is 12:14 p.m.  2 (Whereupon, lunch recess was taken  3 from 12:14 p.m. until 12:45 p.m.)  4 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the  5 record. The time is 12:45 p.m.  6 BY MS. WEISS:  7 Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Nichols.  8 A. Good afternoon.  9 Q. You're familiar with a memorandum dated  10 March 19th, 2001, that you sent to Mr. Kenneth  11 Schroeder with copies to Mr. Kispert, Miss Lamb  12 and Miss Nyberg; is that correct?  13 A. Yes.  14 Q. Okay. Prior to that memorandum, did you  15 have occasion to give advice about KLA's option  16 granting program?  17 A. Not that I recall.  18 Q. Can you tell me who Maureen Lamb -- well,  19 first of all, what was her function when you were at  20 KLA? Did you know her?  21 A. Yes, I knew her. And her function at  22 various times was to be the Corporate Controller and  23 later the Vice President of Finance and Treasurer.  24 Q. And Mr. Kispert?  25 A. When I joined the company, he was the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 107</p> <p>1 on the company's server. There's nothing in terms  2 of calendar entries that would have resided solely  3 on my computer. It would have been on the  4 network -- on the servers for the network.  5 Q. I've noticed in going through your notes  6 that there are occasions when statements are quoted.  7 Did you have a custom and practice of taking notes  8 where you used quotation marks?  9 A. A custom and practice? I don't know that  10 I would put it that way. There could be a variety  11 of reasons why I would want to remember specifically  12 what was said, but I can't resolve that into a rule  13 of when I did it and when I didn't do it.  14 Q. Okay. But I guess what I'm asking is:  15 When I see a quotation, is it generally true that  16 you are writing down what someone who is speaking  17 to you is saying rather than what you are saying to  18 that person?  19 A. I think -- yes, I think generally that's  20 true.  21 MS. WEISS: Okay. All right. So I'm  22 going to go to another subject area. If you guys  23 want to grab a sandwich, this is a good time to do  24 that.  25 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Off the record. The</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 109</p> <p>1 Vice President of Finance, or some similar title,  2 and -- I guess it was Vice President of Finance and  3 Accounting. And then in I believe it was mid 2000,  4 the middle of the year 2000, he was appointed to  5 Chief Financial Officer.  6 Q. And Miss Nyberg?  7 A. She was the -- excuse me -- Senior  8 Director of Compensation or maybe Compensation  9 and Benefits. I'm not sure.  10 Q. Okay. So going back to Mr. Kispert. From  11 your perspective as general counsel, what did you  12 believe his role was first as Vice President of  13 Finance and Accounting? Would you generally  14 describe what you thought he was responsible for.  15 A. Mr. Kispert had ultimate responsibility  16 for matters relating to the finance and accounting  17 organizations.  18 Q. What does that mean to say he had  19 "ultimate responsibility" for them?  20 A. Those functions reported to him.  21 Q. What was his day-to-day responsibility,  22 from your perspective?  23 A. Now we're talking about --  24 Q. Still when he was Vice President of  25 Finance and Accounting.</p>

28 (Pages 106 to 109)

Nichols, Stuart J. Esq.

1/27/2008

<p>1           MR. BELNICK: This, I believe, would  2 require him to disclose privileged information.  3 KLA's counsel agrees and so we will abide by their  4 objection.</p> <p>5           MS. WEISS: Okay. Which privilege are you  6 asserting?</p> <p>7           MR. BELNICK: Attorney-client.</p> <p>8           MS. WEISS: Only?</p> <p>9           MR. BELNICK: I believe so. If work  10 product is involved here, I'd rather not be the one  11 to have to parse --</p> <p>12           MS. WEISS: Okay. If work product is  13 involved, you need to state for the record --</p> <p>14           MS. HEINTZ: We will object on the basis  15 of attorney-client and work product.</p> <p>16           MS. WEISS: Okay. I'm going to voir dire  17 the witness on work product.</p> <p>18 BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>19           Q. Did you come to an understanding of  20 what Mr. Kispert's responsibilities were as Vice  21 President of Finance and Accounting in anticipation  22 of litigation?</p> <p>23           MR. BELNICK: Of any litigation?</p> <p>24           THE WITNESS: No.</p> <p>25 BY MS. WEISS:</p>	<p>Page 110</p> <p>1           MS. WEISS: I'm sorry. What's your last  2 name?</p> <p>3           MS. HEINTZ: Miss Heintz.</p> <p>4           MS. WEISS: Miss Heintz, are you asserting  5 the attorney-client privilege with respect to my  6 questions of Mr. Nichols as to what his perception  7 of Mr. Kispert's duties were as Chief Financial  8 Officer on the grounds of the attorney-client  9 privilege?</p> <p>10           MS. HEINTZ: You said from his perspective  11 as the general counsel?</p> <p>12           MS. WEISS: Yes.</p> <p>13           MS. HEINTZ: Yes.</p> <p>14           MS. WEISS: Are you also asserting work  15 product protection?</p> <p>16           MS. HEINTZ: Not at this time.</p> <p>17 BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>18           Q. Okay. And to be clear, Mr. Nichols,  19 you did not come to an understanding of what  20 Mr. Kispert's responsibilities were as Chief  21 Financial Officer in anticipation of litigation;  22 correct?</p> <p>23           A. That's correct.</p> <p>24           Q. As general counsel, what was your  25 understanding of Miss Lamb's responsibilities as</p>
<p>1           Q. All right. With respect to Mr. Kispert,  2 when he became Chief Financial Officer, from your  3 perspective as general counsel, what did you believe  4 his responsibilities were?</p> <p>5           A. His -- I thought -- now, this is  6 different. Now the question --</p> <p>7           MS. WEISS: You know, I think that you're  8 speaking quietly. If you can bring it up a little  9 higher.</p> <p>10           THE VIDEOGRAPHER: I only have a room mic.</p> <p>11           MS. WEISS: I think you might have him  12 switched. You have Mr. Belnick as Mr. Fickes.</p> <p>13           DEPOSITION REPORTER: Do I have them  14 switched?</p> <p>15           MR. BELNICK: It's an honor.</p> <p>16           MS. WEISS: All right. So now the  17 question is the same question except with respect  18 to the CFO. Could you -- are you asserting the  19 privilege with respect to his perception of --  20 Mr. Nichols' perception of Mr. Kispert's  21 responsibilities as Chief Financial Officer?</p> <p>22           MR. BELNICK: As a general matter, I don't  23 think it's privileged unless KLA thinks otherwise.</p> <p>24           MS. HEINTZ: It's getting difficult to  25 parse through these as the questions go on.</p>	<p>Page 111</p> <p>1           Corporate Controller during the time she held that  2 function?</p> <p>3           MS. HEINTZ: I'm going to object to this  4 on the basis of attorney-client privilege.</p> <p>5           MS. WEISS: But not attorney work product?</p> <p>6           MS. HEINTZ: Not at this time.</p> <p>7           MS. WEISS: Same question with respect  8 to Miss Lamb as Vice President of Finance and as  9 Treasurer. Same answer?</p> <p>10           MS. HEINTZ: Yes.</p> <p>11 BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>12           Q. And it would be correct, Mr. Nichols,  13 that you did not come to an understanding of the  14 roles of Miss Lamb as Corporate Controller or  15 as Vice President of Finance and Treasurer in  16 anticipation of litigation; correct?</p> <p>17           A. That's correct.</p> <p>18           Q. Moving to Miss Nyberg. What was your  19 perception of her responsibilities from your  20 perspective as general counsel?</p> <p>21           MS. HEINTZ: Same objection.</p> <p>22 BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>23           Q. And you did not come to your understanding  24 of her responsibilities as Director of Compensation  25 and Benefits in anticipation of litigation; correct,</p>

29 (Pages 110 to 113)

<p>1 sir?</p> <p>2 A. That's correct.</p> <p>3 MS. WEISS: Okay. So I'll mark next in</p> <p>4 order which we're at 55.</p> <p>5 (Whereupon, Exhibit 55 was marked</p> <p>6 for identification.)</p> <p>7 MS. WEISS: Okay. Exhibit 55, for the</p> <p>8 record, is a compilation of several pages, Bates</p> <p>9 Nos. KT ACWP-PRIV00004298 through and including the</p> <p>10 same prefix, last four digits 4304. The first page</p> <p>11 of the compilation is an email from Stuart Nichols</p> <p>12 dated January 5th, 2000. Okay. It shows Greenwich</p> <p>13 Mean Time, which I'm not exactly sure how to</p> <p>14 translate that, but we will at some point translate</p> <p>15 it.</p> <p>16 The email is apparently sent to Ken Levy</p> <p>17 and Bob Boehlke. The subject is "Option program</p> <p>18 milestones."</p> <p>19 First, the email states, "Here is my first</p> <p>20 stab at a series of milestones. Ken, I suspect that</p> <p>21 you may be interested in more granularity than I've</p> <p>22 outlined here. If so, let me know what you would</p> <p>23 like to see added. Stu."</p> <p>24 BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>25 Q. Mr. Nichols, did you send Exhibit 55 to</p>	<p>Page 114</p> <p>1 Q. So if the attached pages which refer to</p> <p>2 an option transfer program were prepared by someone</p> <p>3 else at your request, you would still have reviewed</p> <p>4 them before sending them out to Mr. Levy and</p> <p>5 Mr. Boehlke. Can we assume that's true?</p> <p>6 A. Well, except that you're suggesting that I</p> <p>7 had this prepared at my request. I don't know that</p> <p>8 to be true. It could have been prepared completely</p> <p>9 independently of my request.</p> <p>10 Q. Okay. The first comment says, "Here is my</p> <p>11 first stab at a series of milestones."</p> <p>12 Does that comment refresh your</p> <p>13 recollection that you had something to do with</p> <p>14 the preparation of the attached?</p> <p>15 A. It certainly would indicate from the words</p> <p>16 written here that I would have. I don't have a</p> <p>17 memory of preparing this schedule. It could well</p> <p>18 have been prepared --</p> <p>19 MR. BELNICK: Well, the question is: Do</p> <p>20 you have an independent recollection?</p> <p>21 THE WITNESS: No, I don't.</p> <p>22 BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>23 Q. You don't recall preparing the schedule.</p> <p>24 But if you sent the schedule out to Mr. Levy and</p> <p>25 Mr. Boehlke, it would have been a schedule that you</p>
<p>Page 115</p> <p>1 Mr. Levy and Mr. Boehlke on January 5th as shown?</p> <p>2 MR. BELNICK: You can answer it.</p> <p>3 THE WITNESS: I don't have a specific</p> <p>4 memory of this email as I sit here. I don't doubt</p> <p>5 that I did.</p> <p>6 BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>7 Q. Okay. This email was produced from the</p> <p>8 corporate records of KLA-Tencor. You have no reason</p> <p>9 to believe that you did not send the email as shown</p> <p>10 here. Would that be correct?</p> <p>11 A. Correct.</p> <p>12 Q. There are going to be some things that you</p> <p>13 don't remember because of the passage of time. We</p> <p>14 understand that so you just need to say that and</p> <p>15 we'll move on.</p> <p>16 There are several attached pages to the</p> <p>17 email. Did you prepare the attached pages to the</p> <p>18 email, Mr. Nichols?</p> <p>19 A. I don't know.</p> <p>20 Q. Does that mean you don't recall?</p> <p>21 A. That means I don't recall.</p> <p>22 Q. Generally would it have been your practice</p> <p>23 to review the attached pages of any email that you</p> <p>24 sent?</p> <p>25 A. Yes.</p>	<p>Page 116</p> <p>1 reviewed before sending it; correct?</p> <p>2 A. Yes.</p> <p>3 Q. And if you characterized it as your "first</p> <p>4 stab at a series of milestones," it would have been</p> <p>5 something, would it not, Mr. Nichols, that you had</p> <p>6 something to do with; correct?</p> <p>7 MR. BELNICK: Object to the form. But I</p> <p>8 think he's answered.</p> <p>9 THE WITNESS: No, that's that not correct.</p> <p>10 Something to do with, I suppose. But I don't have</p> <p>11 any idea whether this schedule was prepared by</p> <p>12 someone else. And the "stab" that I'm alluding to</p> <p>13 is a minor revision of something on here.</p> <p>14 So I don't know that I prepared it. I</p> <p>15 certainly would have reviewed it before I sent it</p> <p>16 out. That would have been my practice.</p> <p>17 BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>18 Q. Does anything about the attachment refresh</p> <p>19 your recollection about what the option program</p> <p>20 milestones were? What the general subject matter</p> <p>21 was?</p> <p>22 A. Well, I have a general memory of the</p> <p>23 option program. Your question assumed that I needed</p> <p>24 to have my memory refreshed on the program itself.</p> <p>25 Q. Thank you. So let me back up.</p>

Nichols, Stuart J. Esq.

1/27/2008

Page 118	Page 120
<p>1        What was the option program that was being  2        discussed in this email?</p> <p>3        MS. HEINTZ: We're going to object to that  4        question.</p> <p>5        MS. WEISS: And what's your basis?</p> <p>6        MS. HEINTZ: On the basis of  7        attorney-client privilege.</p> <p>8        MS. WEISS: And you're instructing him not  9        to answer?</p> <p>10       MS. HEINTZ: We are.</p> <p>11       MS. WEISS: Are you objecting on the basis  12       of the work product protection?</p> <p>13       MS. HEINTZ: No; yes.</p> <p>14       BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>15       Q. Mr. Nichols, did you send Exhibit 55  16       to Mr. Levy and Mr. Boehlke in anticipation of  17       litigation?</p> <p>18       A. I believed that there was a potential for  19       litigation relative to this program.</p> <p>20       Q. So is the answer yes?</p> <p>21       A. Yes.</p> <p>22       Q. Let me read from a definition of the  23       terminology "anticipated litigation" from the  24       Ninth Circuit case because I know the terminology  25       is not self-explanatory.</p>	<p>1        We're objecting on the grounds that it asked the  2        witness to make a legal conclusion.</p> <p>3        BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>4        Q. Okay. Mr. Nichols, I'm asking you to  5        testify as to facts. Did you create this document,  6        Exhibit 55, in anticipation of litigation under the  7        definition that I just read to you?</p> <p>8        MR. BELNICK: I believe KLA has objected  9        to that, Miss Weiss, unless I'm wrong.</p> <p>10       MS. HEINTZ: We have objected to that. We  11        can argue over the definition of "work product  12        privilege" over papers. We have objected to it.  13        The witness has testified that he created the  14        document in anticipation of litigation. We request  15        that he does not answer the question.</p> <p>16       MS. WEISS: Counsel, after I read the  17        definition, according to the Ninth Circuit, I  18        believe that the witness was about to change his  19        testimony. Now --</p> <p>20       MR. BELNICK: But I don't think there's a  21        basis for that, Miss Weiss --</p> <p>22       MS. WEISS: Well, why don't you let him  23        answer the question? He can say yes or no.</p> <p>24       MR. BELNICK: I'm not objecting. I'm  25        following -- as I told you, the witness and I are</p>
<p>1        Quote, "A document was created because of  2        the anticipated litigation and would not have been  3        created in substantially similar form but for the  4        prospect of that litigation."</p> <p>5        A. Okay. Then --</p> <p>6        MR. BELNICK: Whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa.  7        There's no question.</p> <p>8        BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>9        Q. Applying that definition -- which, by the  10       way, this is from in re Grand Jury Subpoena 357  11       Fed.3rd, 900, at pages 907 to 910. Applying that  12       definition, was this document, Exhibit 55, created  13       in anticipation of litigation?</p> <p>14       MS. HEINTZ: We're going to object. The  15       witness has testified that this document was created  16       in anticipation of litigation or communication made  17       in anticipation of litigation. So we will request  18       that the witness not answer the question.</p> <p>19       MR. FICKES: I have an objection, too. We  20       are objecting on the grounds that it asks for a  21       legal conclusion.</p> <p>22       THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Excuse me. One moment.  23       I only have that room mic, you guys. You need to  24       bring your voice up or we won't have it.</p> <p>25       MR. FICKES: Sorry. I'll do it louder.</p>	<p>1        following the direction of his former client. But  2        I just want you to know I'm just saying don't assume  3        when he started to talk before a question was  4        answered that he was about to disagree or agree  5        with something he said before. I haven't the  6        slightest --</p> <p>7        MS. WEISS: Then he can tell me that. I  8        just need him to answer the question. The work  9        product protection is only triggered by specific  10        facts. I need to get his answer as to whether or  11        not those facts existed. If he says that they did,  12        we'll move on.</p> <p>13       MR. BELNICK: Well, he did testify that  14        he -- I may not be doing this word for word, Shirli.  15        But he did testify that he thought litigation  16        might well result from the program discussed in  17        Exhibit 55. That's the answer.</p> <p>18       Now, asking him to apply the definition  19        from a Ninth Circuit case, whether or not that sets  20        a prevailing rule, I don't have the slightest idea  21        in the Ninth Circuit. That question KLA has taken  22        exception and asked him not to answer so he's not  23        answering.</p> <p>24       MS. WEISS: So I'm going to repeat the  25        question for the record and then if you instruct him</p>

31 (Pages 118 to 121)

Nichols, Stuart J. Esq.

1/27/2008

<p>1 not to answer, then I'll have a clear record. When  2 I say "you," I mean either of you.  3 MR. BELNICK: I understand. Well, all  4 right. Then I'll have to tell you again: If I  5 object, it's not me objecting as his counsel. It's  6 me objecting so that my client does not in any way  7 violate the instructions of his former client, which  8 he is obliged to follow as a matter of law and  9 ethics, as we all know.  10 BY MS. WEISS:  11 Q. Mr. Nichols, was Exhibit 55 created  12 because of anticipated litigation and would not have  13 been created in substantially similar form but for  14 the prospect of that litigation?  15 MS. HEINTZ: We're instructing Mr. Nichols  16 not to answer that question. It's calling for a  17 legal conclusion and there is too much legal parsing  18 to that question. He has already testified he  19 created the document in anticipation of litigation.  20 On that basis, we're requesting that he does not  21 answer the question.  22 MS. WEISS: Counsel, I am entitled to get  23 the factual basis of a conclusory statement that he  24 created it in anticipation of litigation. I've read  25 to you from the Ninth Circuit; I've quoted to you</p>	<p>Page 122</p> <p>1 All right. I think you've been instructed  2 not to answer so I will move on to the next exhibit,  3 Mr. Nichols.  4 (Whereupon, Exhibit 56 was marked  5 for identification.)  6 MR. BELNICK: Okay. The witness has looked  7 at it.  8 MS. WEISS: All right. Let me just get my  9 date here.  10 All right. Exhibit 56 is a compilation of  11 emails Bates stamped KT ACWP-PRIV00004938 through  12 and including the same prefix, 4940.  13 It's an email chain. The first email in  14 the exhibit begins on 4939. It's dated January 5th,  15 2000, 1:01 p.m., from Leslie Wilson to Stu Nichols  16 Mark Nordstrom, Tracy Laboy, Mike Kahn and Joy  17 Nyberg, and also to raman.chitkara@u.pwcglobal.com.  18 The subject is "Stock Options for Outside  19 Consultants" and the importance is identified  20 as high.  21 BY MS. WEISS:  22 Q. Mr. Nichols, do you see that you are  23 shown as one of the recipients of this email from  24 Ms. Wilson on Exhibit 56?  25 A. Yes.</p> <p>Page 124</p>
<p>1 from the Ninth Circuit. Are you instructing him  2 not to tell me whether or not this Exhibit 55 was  3 created in such a way to meet the standard that I  4 just explained? You're telling him he cannot even  5 answer that question?  6 MS. HEINTZ: You're asking him to answer  7 a question that invoked -- the right to invoke the  8 attorney work product.  9 MS. WEISS: Well, Counsel, KLA has the  10 burden of proof on the work product. And as best as  11 I can tell, you're not only not carrying your burden  12 of proof, but you're preventing me from asking  13 foundational questions that would establish one  14 way or the other whether or not the privilege is  15 asserted in good faith.  16 And so I'm going to assume that it's being  17 asserted in bad faith at this point. We're going to  18 make our record and I am going to explain that to  19 the court.  20 MS. HEINTZ: There's also the  21 attorney-client privilege that has been invoked  22 here. And your question also requests information  23 that is protected by the attorney-client privilege.  24 MS. WEISS: Yes. And you've made your  25 record on that.</p>	<p>Page 123</p> <p>1 Q. Could you tell me who Leslie Wilson is?  2 A. Do you mean what her title was at KLA?  3 Q. Yes.  4 A. Well, it appears from the email that she  5 was the Director of Global Compensation Benefits and  6 HRIS.  7 Q. And you say that because she probably  8 signed it somewhere.  9 MR. FICKES: On page 49 --  10 BY MS. WEISS:  11 Q. Yes, there it is (indicating).  12 And do you remember her at the company?  13 A. Very vaguely.  14 Q. Generally speaking, what was the Director  15 of Global Compensation Benefits and HRIS responsible  16 for at the company at that time?  17 A. Well, I have no idea what the HRIS part  18 of it has to do with -- I mean, what the HRIS  19 responsibilities were. Compensation benefits, of  20 course, would be designing compensation and benefits  21 programs for employees.  22 Q. Okay. But did you know -- did you observe  23 at the time what she appeared to be responsible for  24 functionally at the company? She was the lady who  25 did what? Can you answer that?</p> <p>Page 125</p>

32 (Pages 122 to 125)

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 126</p> <p>1           MR. BELNICK: If you can't, you can't.  2           THE WITNESS: Well, I hardly interacted  3 with her. I think she left shortly after this. I  4 don't know what she was responsible for. All I'm  5 telling you is --  6           MR. BELNICK: He's reading her title from  7 the email.  8           THE WITNESS: Below her name is the title  9 of "Director of Global Compensation Benefits and  10 HRIS."  11 BY MS. WEISS:  12           Q. Okay. Who was Mark Nordstrom at that  13 time? What was his function?  14           A. He was the company's treasurer.  15           Q. Did he have any accounting functions, to  16 your perception?  17           A. Not so far as I know.  18           Q. Who did he report to?  19           A. John Kispert. Well, either John Kispert  20 or Bob Boehlke. I'm not completely sure.  21           Q. Who was Tracy Laboy at that time in terms  22 of function?  23           A. At that time Tracy Laboy was responsible  24 for stock administration.  25           Q. And what was stock administration</p>	<p>1 in terms of function?  2           A. I believe at that time Mike Kahn was  3 acting as the VP of HR.  4           Q. Okay. And what was your perception as  5 general counsel of his role as VP of HR in terms of  6 function at that time?  7           MS. HEINTZ: We're going to object to that  8 on the basis of attorney-client privilege.  9 BY MS. WEISS:  10           Q. Did you learn about Mr. Kahn's role in  11 anticipation of litigation?  12           A. No.  13           Q. Moving to Joy Nyberg. What was  14 Miss Nyberg's role at the time of this email?  15           MS. HEINTZ: We're going to object to that  16 on the basis of attorney-client privilege.  17 BY MS. WEISS:  18           Q. Did you learn about Miss Nyberg's role and  19 functions in anticipation of litigation?  20           A. No.  21           Q. There's a reference to what appears to be  22 a person from PWC Global.  23           Do you see that, sir?  24           A. Yes.  25           Q. Were the outside auditors for KLA in the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 127</p> <p>1 responsible for?  2           A. The recordkeeping and other actions  3 required in connection with the granting of stock  4 options.  5           Q. Did she enter dates into the company  6 software system regarding options, if you know?  7           MS. HEINTZ: We're going to object to that  8 and instruct the witness not to answer on the basis  9 of attorney-client privilege.  10           MS. WEISS: Okay. Is that the only  11 privilege you're asserting?  12           MS. HEINTZ: You can ask whether or not  13 he found out this information in anticipation of  14 litigation.  15 BY MS. WEISS:  16           Q. Did you learn Miss Laboy's role in  17 anticipation of litigation?  18           A. No.  19           MS. WEISS: So you're instructing him  20 not to answer with respect to all of my questions  21 concerning Miss Laboy's functions, roles and actions  22 within the company; is that right?  23           MS. HEINTZ: Yes.  24 BY MS. WEISS:  25           Q. Okay. Who is Mike Kahn, if you know, sir,</p>	<p>1 2000 time period PriceWaterhouseCoopers?  2           A. Yes.  3           Q. And do you believe that the  4 gentleman referred to was an accountant at  5 PriceWaterhouseCoopers?  6           MR. FICKES: Well, maybe we could --  7 BY MS. WEISS:  8           Q. Do you know who he was? Let's start  9 there. Do you know who this person is that's  10 referred to?  11           A. Mr. Chitkara was the engagement partner  12 for PWC for the KLA-Tencor account.  13           Q. Okay. And during what time period did he  14 serve in that role, do you recall?  15           A. Not specifically. I believe he was  16 the engagement partner when I joined the company;  17 however, he was not the engagement partner when I  18 left the company.  19           Q. Who was when you left?  20           A. I believe his name was Rob Gittings, and I  21 think it's spelled G-i-t-t-i-n-g-s.  22           Q. What was the reason for the change, do you  23 know?  24           A. I don't know.  25           Q. All right. The email states in the</p>

Nichols, Stuart J. Esq.

1/27/2008

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 130</p> <p>1 first paragraph, "This email is a follow up to our  2 12/23/99 meeting concerning the financial impact  3 of granting stock options to outside consultants."  4 Do you see that, sir?  5 A. Yes.  6 Q. Do you recall discussions with company  7 personnel at the time of this email regarding  8 granting of stock options to outside consultants?  9 MR. BELNICK: You can answer whether you  10 recall or not.  11 THE WITNESS: No.  12 BY MS. WEISS:  13 Q. The email appears to be forwarding a  14 draft of Ms. Wilson's communication -- proposed  15 communication with Ken concerning the financial  16 impact of granting stock options to outside  17 consultants.  18 In reviewing the email, do you believe  19 that she is drafting an email to Ken Schroeder or  20 Ken Levy?  21 MR. BELNICK: Just from looking at the  22 email?  23 MS. WEISS: Yes.  24 MR. BELNICK: Well, I think you can --  25 Shirl, we'll stipulate that it says that the goal</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 132</p> <p>1 MS. WEISS: Exhibit 57 (indicating).  2 (Whereupon, Exhibit 57 was marked  3 for identification.)  4 MS. WEISS: Okay. Exhibit 57 is entitled  5 "Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Directors  6 of KLA-Tencor Corporation January 25, 2000." It's  7 Bates stamped MLB/KLA-SEC00021958 to 21961.  8 BY MS. WEISS:  9 Q. Would you review it, sir, and tell me if  10 that's your signature as Vice President, General  11 Counsel, Secretary of the meeting?  12 A. Yeah, it appears to be a photocopy of my  13 signature.  14 Q. Okay. All right. And it was your custom  15 in acting as the secretary of board of directors  16 meetings to record the attendees, as is shown in  17 this exhibit; is that correct?  18 A. You're asking me whether this exhibit  19 shows the attendees at the meeting that I had in  20 my notes recalled or what have you? What's the  21 question?  22 Q. The question is: When you acted as  23 secretary for the meeting, did you record accurately  24 the attendees in the minutes?  25 A. Well, the minutes contain a list of the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 131</p> <p>1 is to provide Ken Schroeder.  2 MS. WEISS: Well, I don't see that. Where  3 do you see that?  4 MR. BELNICK: Look above the word "Draft."  5 MS. WEISS: Yes, it sure does.  6 BY MS. WEISS:  7 Q. Okay. The first page of the exhibit  8 appears to be an email from you to Leslie Wilson  9 regarding the email that she sent to you and others.  10 And the subject matter line is the same. And the  11 first paragraph states, "Leslie, forgive me, I  12 couldn't help but exercise a little editorial  13 discretion here," and then it goes on to say,  14 "Please bear in mind I'm not an accountant." And  15 then, "In any case, my suggested rewrite follows."  16 Do you see that, sir?  17 A. Yes.  18 Q. And what was your purpose in communicating  19 with Miss Wilson on this subject matter?  20 MS. HEINTZ: We're going to object on the  21 basis of attorney-client privilege.  22 BY MS. WEISS:  23 Q. Okay. And was this email sent back by you  24 to Miss Wilson in anticipation of litigation?  25 A. Not that I recall.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 133</p> <p>1 people who attended; and, yes, it would have been  2 my effort to record that accurately.  3 MS. WEISS: Okay. Exhibit 89.  4 DEPOSITION REPORTER: 58.  5 MS. WEISS: Oops. Sorry. 58. Cross  6 reference 89.  7 (Whereupon, Exhibit 58 was marked  8 for identification.)  9 MS. WEISS: Okay. Exhibit 58 is an email  10 chain Bates stamped MLB/KLA-SEC00051399 to 51400.  11 The email chain starts with an email from Leslie  12 Wilson dated February 11, 2000, 3:31 p.m. to Ken  13 Schroeder, cc: Mike Kahn, Stuart Nichols, Mark  14 Nordstrom, Tracy Laboy, Raman Chitkara; "Subject:  15 Stock options to outside consultants," "Sensitivity:  16 Confidential." And then there's a message to Ken  17 Schroeder.  18 And there's a response from Mr. Schroeder  19 to Ms. Wilson which then appears to be forwarded  20 by Ms. Wilson to Mr. Nordstrom, Ms. Lamb and  21 Mr. Kispert with a message from Miss Wilson.  22 BY MS. WEISS:  23 Mr. Nichols, do you recall receiving the  24 email that shows you as a cc on February 11, 2000?  25 A. No.</p>

34 (Pages 130 to 133)

Nichols, Stuart J. Esq.

1/27/2008

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 134</p> <p>1 Q. Do you recall any discussions concerning 2 the topic of outside consultants and accounting for 3 outside consultants?</p> <p>4 MR. BELNICK: You can answer either yes or 5 no.</p> <p>6 THE WITNESS: I don't recall specific 7 discussions as they relate to this email. I do -- 8 yeah, so I'll leave it at that.</p> <p>9 BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>10 Q. Do you recall any discussions concerning 11 accounting for options to outside consultants?</p> <p>12 MR. BELNICK: While he was at the company?</p> <p>13 MS. WEISS: Yes.</p> <p>14 MR. BELNICK: You can answer that yes or 15 no.</p> <p>16 THE WITNESS: And when you say 17 "discussions," do you mean oral conversations?</p> <p>18 BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>19 Q. No. I'm including email discussion as 20 well.</p> <p>21 MR. BELNICK: Whether writing or oral 22 allowed.</p> <p>23 THE WITNESS: Yes, I remember discussions.</p> <p>24 BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>25 Q. So you have in mind specific discussions</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 136</p> <p>1 discussion? Can you say that?</p> <p>2 MS. HEINTZ: We're going to object to that 3 on the basis of attorney-client privilege.</p> <p>4 BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>5 Q. Did you have more than one discussion, 6 Mr. Nichols?</p> <p>7 A. I don't recall.</p> <p>8 Q. As to the discussions that you do recall, 9 from your standpoint, were they conducted in an 10 anticipation of litigation?</p> <p>11 A. No.</p> <p>12 MS. WEISS: Okay. Exhibit 97 -- not 97, 13 59.</p> <p>14 (Whereupon, Exhibit 59 was marked 15 for identification.)</p> <p>16 MS. WEISS: Exhibit 59 are "Minutes of 17 the Meeting of the Board of Directors of KLA-Tencor 18 Corporation" dated April 25th, 2000. It's Bates 19 stamped MLB/KLA-SEC00021983 and to 21984.</p> <p>20 BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>21 Q. Mr. Nichols, would you review Exhibit 59 22 and tell me if that's your signature on the second 23 page above your name and title Vice President and 24 General Counsel.</p> <p>25 A. This appears to be a photocopy of my</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 135</p> <p>1 that you had with personnel at KLA-Tencor that 2 involved accounting for stock options to outside 3 consultants?</p> <p>4 A. Yes.</p> <p>5 Q. And who were the personnel that you recall 6 having the discussions with?</p> <p>7 MR. BELNICK: Go ahead, you can answer 8 that.</p> <p>9 THE WITNESS: John Kispert.</p> <p>10 BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>11 Q. And approximately what time period? Can 12 you identify it?</p> <p>13 A. No. I believe it was later than this, 14 though.</p> <p>15 MR. BELNICK: "This" being February 2000?</p> <p>16 THE WITNESS: Correct.</p> <p>17 BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>18 Q. Was it within 2000, do you think?</p> <p>19 A. No, I don't believe it was.</p> <p>20 Q. What year do you think it occurred?</p> <p>21 A. Later in my tenure. I can't identify the 22 year, but 2003 or perhaps later than that.</p> <p>23 Q. So you had a discussion with Mr. Kispert 24 involving accounting for stock options to outside 25 consultants. What was the purpose of the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 137</p> <p>1 signature.</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. On the second page -- well, first 3 of all, it would have been your practice, correct, 4 to record on the minutes the attendees at the 5 meeting; is that correct?</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. And then --</p> <p>8 MR. BELNICK: Shirli, just to save time.</p> <p>9 If this is acceptable to you and the witness, can we 10 stipulate to the extent Mr. Nichols prepared minutes 11 for board meetings it was always his practice to 12 attend and to accurately reflect who was in 13 attendance?</p> <p>14 MS. WEISS: Yes, we can.</p> <p>15 Is everybody acceptable with that 16 stipulation?</p> <p>17 MS. HEINTZ: Yes.</p> <p>18 MR. FICKES: Yes.</p> <p>19 BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>20 Q. All right. Turning to the second page 21 below "Closed Session," these minutes appear to 22 record that Mr. Levy proposed that Mr. Morton and 23 Ms. Urbanek be appointed to the Audit Committee 24 on an interim basis, and then also that 25 Mr. Levy then appointed Mr. Barnholdt to serve</p>

35 (Pages 134 to 137)

<p>1 with Ms. Urbanek on the Compensation Committee.  2 Do you see that, sir?  3 A. Yes.  4 Q. Do you believe those events were  5 accurately recorded?  6 A. Yes.  7 Q. Okay. So I'm going to ask you to take a  8 look at one of your notebooks. Just give me a  9 second and I'll let you know which one. So it would  10 be Exhibit 42, which is your notebook for the time  11 period June 26th, 2000, commencement date.  12 MR. BELNICK: Page?  13 MS. WEISS: Page 2740.  14 MR. FICKES: I'm sorry. I couldn't hear.  15 MS. WEISS: Page 2740.  16 MR. FICKES: Thank you.  17 BY MS. WEISS:  18 Q. Mr. Nichols, can you tell from reviewing  19 page 2740 in context what date the notes on that  20 page were likely recorded or the time interval?  21 A. Excuse me. There's an entry in -- on a  22 prior set of notes Bates stamped 2737 that bears the  23 date August 9, 2000. So presumably it was sometime  24 after August 9, 2000. And there's a subsequent note  25 on page 2743 bearing the date 8/21/2000. So based</p>	<p>Page 138</p> <p>1 A. Well, I can deduce. I don't have a memory  2 of this conversation.  3 Q. Well, what can you tell me about those  4 notes? What do they mean?  5 MS. HEINTZ: We're going to object that it  6 reveals attorney-client communications.  7 BY MS. WEISS:  8 Q. Okay. Do you think that notation was made  9 in anticipation of litigation?  10 A. No.  11 Q. Below that, what's the word below that?  12 Can you read that to me?  13 A. "Vesting."  14 Q. Vesting. Okay.  15 And then the next page starts off -- it  16 appears to say "Roger." Is that what it says?  17 A. Yes.  18 Q. Okay. Could you read the notes on this  19 page.  20 A. Yeah. "FASB 44, new opinion. Question  21 45 -- an option cancellation.  22 "If six months prior to or after  23 cancellation.  24 "If more than six months, no variable  25 accounting.</p>
<p>Page 139</p> <p>1 on that, presumably sometime between those two  2 dates.  3 Q. All right. Take a look at the notes on  4 2739, the page before.  5 About midway down on the page it says  6 "Bruce" and then it says "Option Program."  7 Do you see that?  8 A. Yes.  9 Q. Do you know who Bruce was or is?  10 A. No. No.  11 Q. It doesn't spark a recollection?  12 A. (Witness nods.)  13 Q. All right. And below that it says "162m."  14 Is that a reference to a code section?  15 A. Probably.  16 Q. Do you know what code section?  17 A. Tax code section.  18 Q. Okay. And would you read the notation to  19 the right of that.  20 A. "If one of top five cancelled and regrant  21 blew through max in plan then wouldn't be able to  22 deduct some of expense."  23 Q. Can you tell from that note, sir, whether  24 or not you were making notes during a conversation  25 with someone?</p>	<p>Page 141</p> <p>1 "Can be no direct or indirect promise  2 that price will be better.  3 "Six plus one day -- one client discussed  4 it.  5 "No other client has done it -- not  6 exciting for employees. Also, negative for the  7 street.  8 "Do we want any sort of give-back or  9 consideration -- three months vesting -- blackout"  10 Q. And then can you tell me if the next page  11 is connected with the prior page in terms of notes?  12 MR. BELNICK: "The next page" being 2741?  13 MS. WEISS: Right.  14 THE WITNESS: Probably.  15 BY MS. WEISS:  16 Q. And what do those notes say?  17 A. "Can surrender a portion of the option  18 but would be an admin," short for administrative,  19 "nightmare."  20 Q. Do you whether or not these notes that  21 you've just read on 2740 and 2741 were taken during  22 a conversation with someone?  23 A. Presumably, yes.  24 Q. Do you think it was Roger Stern?  25 A. I don't have a specific memory of the</p>

Nichols, Stuart J. Esq.

1/27/2008

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 142</p> <p>1 conversation, but that's likely who that was with.  2 Q. Who was Roger Stern at that time?  3 A. Roger Stern at all times during my  4 employment at KLA was a partner at Wilson Sonsini  5 Goodrich &amp; Rosati.  6 Q. Okay. And can you tell me what the notes  7 mean?  8 MS. HEINTZ: We're going to object on the  9 basis of attorney-client privilege.  10 BY MS. WEISS:  11 Q. Okay. And were the notes created in  12 anticipation of litigation?  13 A. No.  14 MS. WEISS: Okay. Can we take a couple  15 minutes? I need to find a couple of items.  16 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the record.  17 The time is 1:35 p.m.  18 (Off the record.)  19 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the  20 record. The time is 1:48 p.m.  21 BY MS. WEISS:  22 Q. Mr. Nichols, directing your attention  23 momentarily back to Exhibit 55. I believe when we  24 started the dialogue, we were talking about option  25 program milestones. And I think at that time</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 144</p> <p>1 you what we'll let him answer. Then you can answer  2 if this is right. The subject matter of the  3 litigation that Mr. Nichols was anticipating at the  4 time of Exhibit 55 was tax-related.  5 BY MS. WEISS:  6 Q. Okay. And was it litigation that you were  7 anticipating that would involve KLA Tencor?  8 A. Potentially, yes.  9 Q. Okay. Had there been any threat of  10 litigation that had actually been communicated to  11 you?  12 A. No.  13 Q. Okay. Putting aside the tax-related  14 litigation and focusing your attention from the time  15 period on the year 2000, can you tell me with  16 respect to any of the communications that you might  17 have had involving KLA's option program -- and I  18 think we've seen a few in the 2000 time period that  19 you may not have recalled -- can you think of any  20 instance where your communication during that time  21 period was in anticipation of litigation?  22 MR. BELNICK: Except to the extent that  23 he's testified?  24 MS. WEISS: Exhibit 55 I think is the only  25 one that he's testified to. I could be wrong. The</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 143</p> <p>1 I asked you whether or not you anticipated  2 litigation when you sent the email and the  3 attachment that is Exhibit 55, and I think at that  4 point you answered yes. So I'd like to return to  5 that for a moment.  6 First of all, was there a pending  7 litigation involving the subject matter of this  8 email at the time?  9 A. No.  10 Q. And could you tell me what litigation you  11 were anticipating at the time?  12 DEPOSITION REPORTER: I'm sorry. Was that  13 for the record?  14 MR. BELNICK: What I said, no.  15 THE WITNESS: I'm not sure how I can do  16 that without talking about privileged opinions.  17 MR. BELNICK: Give me a second and see if  18 I can help you.  19 (Off the record discussion between  20 Deponent and Counsel.)  21 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Microphone.  22 THE WITNESS: I'm just keeping it off in  23 case I have to go back. I won't forget about you.  24 I promise.  25 MR. BELNICK: I'll let him -- let me tell</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 145</p> <p>1 record will show.  2 MR. BELNICK: Right. Apart from whatever  3 you've testified to, if it was more than 55, you  4 have the rest of Miss Weiss's question. Can you  5 think of any other instances?  6 THE WITNESS: No.  7 BY MS. WEISS:  8 Q. Okay. So moving into the 2001 time  9 period, including the time period when you had the  10 email communications that had become the subject of  11 this litigation --  12 A. Which occurred in March --  13 Q. -- which occurred in March of 2001, can  14 you tell me whether or not the communications that  15 you made were in anticipation of litigation?  16 MR. BELNICK: Including the March ones?  17 BY MS. WEISS:  18 Q. Yes.  19 A. No.  20 Q. Okay. Moving into the 2002 time period,  21 same question.  22 A. So just to make sure I have the question  23 clear, you're asking me whether in calendar 2002 I  24 had communications that related to stock options  25 where I was concerned about litigation?</p>

37 (Pages 142 to 145)

Nichols, Stuart J. Esq.

1/27/2008

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 146</p> <p>1 Q. Where you anticipated litigation.    2 A. No.    3 Q. All right. Same question with respect to    4 2003.    5 A. No.    6 Q. You can't think of an instance where you    7 were preparing a communication in anticipation of    8 litigation?    9 MR. BELNICK: With respect to anything    10 having to do with stock options only?    11 MS. WEISS: Only. Stock options, stock    12 option programs, stock option accounting, stock    13 option personnel.    14 MR. BELNICK: Anything.    15 MS. WEISS: You know, the subject matter    16 of what we're talking about here.    17 THE WITNESS: No.    18 BY MS. WEISS:    19 Q. Okay.    20 A. And bear in mind when I say that, whether    21 it's, you know, 2002, 2003 or any other time frame,    22 these are events that occurred a long time ago. And    23 you could well show me a piece of paper that would    24 refresh my recollection. But as I sit here right    25 now, no, I have no memory of such a perception.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 148</p> <p>1 charges and how to do this. Consider that this    2 would be precedent. If they return to KT, then they    3 can keep" -- oh, "board of Newco must approve."    4 Q. Okay. And then the next page is a new and    5 different communication?    6 A. Yes.    7 Q. Okay. And, again, does the fact that you    8 have "Ken Levy," does that indicate to you that the    9 conversation or excerpts of the conversation that    10 are recorded in these notes of a conversation that    11 you had with Mr. Levy?    12 A. Yes.    13 Q. Do you recall the conversation?    14 MR. BELNICK: Yes or no.    15 THE WITNESS: No.    16 BY MS. WEISS:    17 Q. Okay. Taking a look at the next page, it    18 says "8/23," and then there is a reference about a    19 third of the way down to Ken Schroeder. Do you see    20 that?    21 A. Yes.    22 Q. Could you read the notes below Ken    23 Schroeder.    24 A. "Acquire smaller company in same area.    25 Due diligence on IP." Then it says, "Attorney.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 147</p> <p>1 Q. Okay. So, for example, in particular when    2 we get to the March 2001 communications, when you    3 were drafting the communications back and forth, you    4 were not doing those in anticipation of litigation?    5 A. Correct.    6 Q. Okay. That might save us a little time.    7 MR. BELNICK: I hope so.    8 BY MS. WEISS:    9 Q. Just briefly turning your attention to    10 Exhibit 42, Bates stamp page 2744, there is an entry    11 beside 8/22. I believe the year we're referring to    12 is 2000, and there is a reference to Ken Levy. And    13 my request is that you read the page of notes,    14 please.    15 A. The page of notes beginning with "Ken    16 Levy" and below that?    17 Q. Please.    18 A. "Ken Levy," and then it says "new EEs" --    19 that's my abbreviation for employees --    20 "cancellation of some," and then below that, "new    21 option grant in KT, restarted with four-year    22 vesting, five-year term, 50 percent of unvested,    23 could structure as a call, alternative by calls.    24 Can we" -- and then it says, "Can we buy and sell    25 calls to ourselves? Call amounts and figure out</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 149</p> <p>1 Everything so disorganized that it's hard to tell    2 whether IP is of value and whether it's infringing    3 anyone else's IP." And then it says, "Board    4 choices: One, not good enough; two, doesn't    5 matter."    6 Q. Okay. Do you recall -- first of all, does    7 that -- do those notes indicate that you had a    8 conversation with Mr. Schroeder?    9 MR. BELNICK: As you recall.    10 THE WITNESS: I don't recall this    11 conversation with Ken Schroeder, but his -- the fact    12 that his name is here would suggest --    13 MR. BELNICK: The question is do you    14 recall it?    15 THE WITNESS: I don't recall it.    16 BY MS. WEISS:    17 Q. Okay. So nothing about reviewing these    18 notes calls to mind the content or purpose of this    19 particular conversation that I just referred to?    20 A. No, nothing.    21 Q. Okay. And if you would back up to page    22 2743. And the top of the page, the date is 8/21/00,    23 and then it appears to be "T/C with Joy Nyberg." Do    24 I have that right?    25 A. Yes.</p>

38 (Pages 146 to 149)

Nichols, Stuart J. Esq.

1/27/2008

		Page 150	Page 152
1	Q. Does that indicate to you that you had a		
2	conversation with Joy Nyberg?		
3	A. Yes.		
4	Q. Would you read the notes.		
5	A. "Wants nonshareholder-approved plan. Full		
6	program put in place. Wants to be able to issue		
7	double peak grant immediately. (24-hour notice).		
8	**Question: How many years do we have on		
9	evergreen? Nonqual. What board approval required?		
10	What share limits? Can we issue based on July		
11	price? Can we set aside stock ala BRCM? Can you		
12	issue officer shares with only board approval? Is		
13	the evergreen tied specifically to the plan?"		
14	And then it says, "Options: 1,		
15	nonshareholder plan; 2, increase buyback; 3," no		
16	entry; "4, preauthorization."		
17	Q. Okay. First of all, down below where it		
18	says "options," is the term "options" there used as		
19	a synonym for choices?		
20	A. Or alternatives, yes.		
21	Q. Okay. And do you recall this conversation		
22	with Joy Nyberg?		
23	A. No.		
24	Q. You don't recall anything about this		
25	conversation?		
		Page 151	Page 153
1	A. No.		
2	Q. The first reference is to a		
3	nonshareholder-approved plan. Do you recall that		
4	KLA did in fact adopt a nonshareholder-approved plan		
5	sometime in the 2000 time period?		
6	A. Yes.		
7	Q. Do you recall that the		
8	nonshareholder-approved plan is a plan that was		
9	designed to benefit nonofficers?		
10	A. Yes.		
11	Q. And Ms. Nyberg was a nonofficer for		
12	purposes of the plan; correct?		
13	A. Yes.		
14	Q. And when you recorded this question, "Can		
15	we issue based on July price?" It was being		
16	recorded in a conversation that occurred after July;		
17	correct?		
18	MR. BELNICK: I think he said he didn't		
19	recall the conversation.		
20	THE WITNESS: Yeah. I don't recall the		
21	conversation. I see the entry bearing the date.		
22	BY MS. WEISS:		
23	Q. And the date -- it would have been your		
24	custom and practice at the time to date the		
25	conversation on the date that it occurred; correct?		

39 (Pages 150 to 153)

Nichols, Stuart J. Esq.

1/27/2008

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 154</p> <p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. And then if you take a look at the months 3 that follow, focusing on the August, September, 4 October and November time period, you'll see that 5 generally, the price goes up and down and is 6 volatile. It's generally trending down. Do you see 7 that?</p> <p>8 A. Yes.</p> <p>9 Q. So that, for example, if you just pick a 10 date, October 10th, 2000, the price on that date is 11 \$35.06 at the open, and the close of the price is 12 \$34.25.</p> <p>13 A. Okay.</p> <p>14 Q. Okay. So does reviewing that chart at all 15 refresh your recollection that during the time 16 period of 2000, the general price of KLA Tencor 17 stock was declining in the marketplace?</p> <p>18 A. No. I mean, I see this document. It 19 speaks for itself. If you're asking me whether I 20 ever had a memory about what KLA's stock price was 21 doing in the year 2000, the answer is no, I don't 22 have a memory of that.</p> <p>23 Q. All right. And so generally, do you have 24 a memory that in 2000, technology companies' stock 25 in general declined in value, that that was the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 156</p> <p>1 is an email chain, Bates stamped MLB/KLA-SEC00022981 2 through MLB/KLA-SEC00022982. And the email chain 3 starts at the 22982 page, the email from Joy Nyberg 4 to Maureen Lamb, John Kispert and Stuart Nichols, cc 5 to Frank Brienz, and it says, "Draft of Board 6 Presentation for Ken." "Importance: High." 7 "Sensitivity: Confidential." And it refers to a 8 draft of slides for Ken Schroeder to present at the 9 October board, a nonshareholder plan.</p> <p>10 Then there is a response from Maureen Lamb 11 on the next email, and it is sent October 5th, 2000. 12 And then a response by yourself to Maureen Lamb 13 dated October 9th, 2000.</p> <p>14 Do you see that email chain, sir?</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 Q. Do you recall dialogue with Maureen Lamb 17 and Joy Nyberg concerning the 18 nonshareholder-approved plan in or about this time 19 period?</p> <p>20 MR. BELNICK: Yes or no.</p> <p>21 THE WITNESS: No.</p> <p>22 BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>23 Q. Do you recall a discussion whereby these 24 personnel were talking about different ways that 25 option shares could be awarded to employees using</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 155</p> <p>1 subject of much discussion?</p> <p>2 A. Yes.</p> <p>3 Q. And do you think that KLA Tencor was 4 different from the general decline of technology 5 companies in the marketplace in 2000?</p> <p>6 A. No.</p> <p>7 Q. And in connection with the decline of 8 prices in the marketplace, was there concern 9 expressed at KLA by senior management that it was 10 important to think about option grants to employees?</p> <p>11 MS. HEINTZ: Objection on the basis of 12 attorney-client privilege.</p> <p>13 MR. FICKES: I'll also object that the 14 question is vague and ambiguous as far as "concern" 15 and "senior management."</p> <p>16 MS. WEISS: You're not going to respond to 17 that question on the basis of the privilege 18 asserted; is that right?</p> <p>19 MR. BELNICK: That's right. He won't.</p> <p>20 MS. WEISS: Okay. So much for that.</p> <p>21 Okay. Exhibit 61.</p> <p>22 (Whereupon, Exhibit 61 was marked 23 for identification.)</p> <p>24 BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>25 Q. Okay. Exhibit 61 is Bates stamped -- it</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 157</p> <p>1 different strategies such as splitting them up, 2 trying to project the time? Do you remember this 3 time -- this type of conversation during this time 4 period at all?</p> <p>5 MS. HEINTZ: We're going to object on the 6 basis of attorney-client privilege.</p> <p>7 MS. WEISS: This is a yes or no answer, 8 though.</p> <p>9 MS. HEINTZ: You're asking for the text of 10 or the content of communications.</p> <p>11 DEPOSITION REPORTER: I'm sorry. I didn't 12 get the last part.</p> <p>13 MS. HEINTZ: It's asking for the content 14 of communications. It's not a general subject 15 matter.</p> <p>16 BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>17 Q. Okay. Well, do you recall the general 18 subject matter being discussed in the fall of 2000 19 at KLA Tencor about how to make stock option awards 20 in the future to employees?</p> <p>21 MR. BELNICK: Yes or no whether you 22 recall.</p> <p>23 THE WITNESS: No.</p> <p>24 BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>25 Q. Do you see at the top of the page your</p>

40 (Pages 154 to 157)

Nichols, Stuart J. Esq.

1/27/2008

Page 158	Page 160
<p>1 email to Miss Lamb? You say by the way -- or "BTW,  2 on your algorithm point, at my last job we did the  3 same thing. The formula was quite simple. We  4 distributed the pool of new grants based on each  5 employee's allocated share of underwater options.  6 Next time you're passing by, I'll explain."</p> <p>7 Do you see that?</p> <p>8 A. Yes.</p> <p>9 Q. Did you send that email to Miss Lamb about  10 the date shown?</p> <p>11 A. I sure don't remember.</p> <p>12 Q. Does reviewing that message refresh your  13 memory about how option grants were awarded at  14 Phoenix Technologies?</p> <p>15 A. No.</p> <p>16 Q. The reference to "pool of new grants" does  17 not refresh your memory that you had a prior  18 experience whereby options were pooled in some way  19 and then awarded?</p> <p>20 A. Quite the contrary.</p> <p>21 Q. Well, what do you remember?</p> <p>22 A. I have no such memory.</p> <p>23 Q. You have no memory one way or another?</p> <p>24 A. Correct.</p> <p>25 MS. WEISS: Exhibit 62.</p>	<p>1 All right. In the minutes under  2 "Strategic Initiatives," there is a reference to a  3 presentation by Mr. Schroeder of an overview of the  4 company's strategic initiatives. And it is also  5 recorded that Mr. Schroeder then addressed the  6 company's stock option programs and the impact of  7 the recent stock price decline on employee unvested  8 gain. And then a further reference that  9 Mr. Schroeder would present something at the  10 November 10th board meeting.</p> <p>11 Do you have a recollection of the  12 presentations referred to on 22088?</p> <p>13 MR. BELNICK: Yes or no?</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: No.</p> <p>15 MS. WEISS: Exhibit 63.</p> <p>16 (Whereupon, Exhibit 63 was marked  17 for identification.)</p> <p>18 BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>19 Q. Exhibit 63 does not bear a Bates stamp.  20 It is a document -- oh, I'm sorry. It does.  21 KT ACWP-PRIV00002401 through 2415.</p> <p>22 Would you review Exhibit 63, Mr. Nichols.</p> <p>23 A. Okay.</p> <p>24 Q. Mr. Nichols, the document -- the first  25 page of the document says, "Draft KLA Tencor</p>
<p>1 (Whereupon, Exhibit 62 was marked  2 for identification.)</p> <p>3 BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>4 Q. Exhibit 62 are the Minutes of the Meeting  5 of the Board of Directors of KLA Tencor Corporation  6 dated October 15th, 2000, Bates number  7 MLB/KLA-SEC00022086 through and including 22088.  8 Mr. Nichols, would you look at Exhibit 62  9 and can you identify your --</p> <p>10 MR. BELNICK: Actually, excuse me, Shirli.  11 Just so your record is complete, our copy goes  12 through 22089.</p> <p>13 MS. WEISS: Okay. You're right. I missed  14 a page. 22089.</p> <p>15 BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>16 Q. Would you tell me if you recognize your  17 signature as Vice President, General Counsel and  18 Secretary of the meeting on 22088?</p> <p>19 A. Yeah, that appears to be a copy -- a  20 photocopy of my signature.</p> <p>21 Q. All right. And same question with 22089.  22 Is that a photocopy of your signature?</p> <p>23 A. It's actually a photocopy of two of my  24 signatures.</p> <p>25 Q. Yes. I see that. Thank you.</p>	<p>1 Employee Retention Stock Option Issue." And then it  2 says, "Discussion Document October 30, 2000." Below  3 that there is the logo of a company called iQuantic,  4 i-Q-u-a-n-t-i-c, Inc.</p> <p>5 Do you recognize the name iQuantic?</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. Could you tell me who iQuantic is or was  8 at that time?</p> <p>9 A. iQuantic was a consulting firm that  10 specialized in advising companies on compensation  11 matters. And I think, though I'm not sure -- well,  12 I'll leave it at that on compensation matters.</p> <p>13 Q. Did iQuantic provide consulting services  14 to KLA Tencor?</p> <p>15 A. I don't know if we engaged them as a  16 consultant, but I know that a representative of  17 iQuantic made a presentation.</p> <p>18 Q. Did that representative make a  19 presentation at a board meeting, do you recall, or  20 Compensation Committee meeting or some other type of  21 meeting?</p> <p>22 A. I don't know which type of meeting it was.  23 I don't believe it was a board meeting.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay.</p> <p>25 A. It could have either been a comp committee</p>

41 (Pages 158 to 161)

Nichols, Stuart J. Esq.

1/27/2008

Page 162	Page 164
<p>1 meeting or a -- just a general informational 2 meeting.</p> <p>3 Q. There was an earlier reference to the 4 nonshareholder-approved plan adopted by KLA Tencor. 5 Do you know, Mr. Nichols, whether or not the idea 6 for a nonshareholder-approved plan originated with 7 iQuantic?</p> <p>8 MR. BELNICK: Yes or no?</p> <p>9 THE WITNESS: No, I don't know.</p> <p>10 BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>11 Q. Did you have any discussion with iQuantic 12 regarding anything about the contents of Exhibit 63, 13 do you recall?</p> <p>14 A. Do you mean me personally?</p> <p>15 Q. Sure.</p> <p>16 A. Not that I recall.</p> <p>17 Q. Who would have been the person at KLA 18 Tencor who would have investigated with iQuantic the 19 parameters of a nonshareholder-approved stock option 20 plan?</p> <p>21 MR. BELNICK: If you know.</p> <p>22 THE WITNESS: I don't know.</p> <p>23 BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>24 Q. You don't know whose bailiwick, if you 25 will, that was in?</p>	<p>1 "Employee Retention Stock Option Program Proposal 2 for Compensation Committee 11/8/08 [sic]" -- I'm 3 sorry -- '00.</p> <p>4 Mr. Nichols, do you recall seeing Exhibit 5 64 before?</p> <p>6 A. No, I don't have a specific recollection 7 of seeing that exhibit before.</p> <p>8 Q. Do you recall the discussion of a strategy 9 at KLA Tencor to make supplemental grants to 10 shareholder -- to employees and officers in two 11 segments?</p> <p>12 MS. HEINTZ: Objection on the basis of 13 attorney-client privilege.</p> <p>14 MS. WEISS: Okay. I think we already have 15 your testimony on work product.</p> <p>16 Exhibit 65.</p> <p>17 (Whereupon, Exhibit 65 was marked 18 for identification.)</p> <p>19 MS. WEISS: And Exhibit 66.</p> <p>20 (Whereupon, Exhibit 66 was marked 21 for identification.)</p> <p>22 BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>23 Q. Mr. Nichols, Exhibit 66 is what appears to 24 be a draft of minutes of the Compensation Committee 25 of KLA-Tencor Corporation, Bates stamped</p>
<p>1 A. Well, I --</p> <p>2 MR. BELNICK: Are you asking him if he 3 knows specifically who he spoke to within iQuantic 4 about this subject matter?</p> <p>5 MS. WEISS: No. I'm asking him whether or 6 not there was a group of people in KLA Tencor who 7 was tasked with interacting with outside consultants 8 on this topic.</p> <p>9 MR. BELNICK: Okay. Then --</p> <p>10 MS. WEISS: Within their purview.</p> <p>11 THE WITNESS: So your question is was 12 there a group within KLA Tencor that was tasked with 13 interacting with this type of consultant?</p> <p>14 BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>15 Q. Yes.</p> <p>16 A. No, I'm not aware of any specific group 17 that was so tasked.</p> <p>18 MS. WEISS: Okay. 64.</p> <p>19 (Whereupon, Exhibit 64 was marked 20 for identification.)</p> <p>21 MR. BELNICK: Okay. He's looked at it.</p> <p>22 BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>23 Q. Exhibit 64, Bates stamped</p> <p>24 MLB/KLA-SEC00004878 through 4898, is what appears to 25 be a PowerPoint presentation with charts entitled,</p>	<p>1 Page 163</p> <p>1 MLB/KLA-SEC00004872 through 4876. 2 And then Exhibit 65 are the Minutes of the 3 Meeting of the Board of Directors of KLA-Tencor 4 Corporation dated November 10th, 2000, Bates stamped 5 MLB/KLA-SEC00004903 through 4907. 6 Now, Exhibit 66 -- we had requested from 7 KLA Tencor copies of all of their Compensation 8 Committee minutes as well as all of their board of 9 directors minutes. And they refused to produce 10 anything, so we don't have any corporate records 11 from KLA. These were produced from the files of the 12 SEC, presumably produced by KLA. But we do not have 13 a final copy of the Compensation Committee minutes, 14 I believe, that were signed by you. 15 These draft minutes appear to indicate 16 that you attended a Compensation Committee meeting 17 held on November 8th, 2000. That appears in the 18 first paragraph of the draft minutes. 19 Mr. Nichols, could you tell me what 20 generally during this time period was your custom 21 and practice in terms of preparation of minutes and 22 signing of them?</p> <p>23 MR. BELNICK: For Compensation Committee?</p> <p>24 MS. WEISS: Yeah. Let's start with 25 Compensation Committee.</p>

42 (Pages 162 to 165)

Nichols, Stuart J. Esq.

1/27/2008

<p>1                   THE WITNESS: So -- and what's the time  2 period you're referring to now?  3 BY MS. WEISS:  4                   Q. This time period, November of 2000.  5                   A. In those -- in that time period, the  6 Compensation Committee meetings typically included a  7 written report that was prepared in advance of the  8 meeting which the members of the comp committee  9 signed. So my practice was to have that be the  10 written record of the meeting.  11                  Q. So let's back up a minute. In order to --  12 you attended the Compensation Committee meetings as  13 a general rule?  14                  A. Yes.  15                  Q. And in order to prepare for the  16 Compensation Committee meetings, did you meet with  17 Joy Nyberg?  18                  A. No.  19                  Q. You never met with her?  20                  A. To prepare for the meetings for the  21 comp --  22                  Q. Yes.  23                  A. No, never.  24                  Q. Okay. And --  25                  A. Well, I shouldn't say "never." I</p>	<p>Page 166</p> <p>1 asserting privilege.  2                  MS. HEINTZ: We assert the privilege and  3 request that the witness not answer.  4 BY MS. WEISS:  5                  Q. Did you prepare an agenda for the  6 Compensation Committee meeting or did someone else?  7                  A. I did not.  8                  Q. How did you obtain an agenda before the  9 meeting or did you?  10                 A. I didn't.  11                 Q. Okay. So what was your role at the  12 meeting? Simply minute taker?  13                 A. At best because, again, my view was that  14 the written report of the actions that were to be  15 taken was a satisfactory memorialization of those  16 actions.  17                 Q. Okay.  18                 A. So in the -- in the early time period, I  19 generally didn't even prepare minutes afterwards.  20                 Q. Okay. And when you say "written report,"  21 is the executive summary of stock retention  22 recommendation, which is part of the exhibit at 4874  23 and 4875, is that an example of a written report?  24                 A. Of -- yes, of a portion of the written  25 report: Yes, that's correct.</p>
<p>1                   certainly don't recall any instance where I did  2 that.  3                  Q. Okay. How did you compile the information  4 or how was the information compiled for submission  5 to the Compensation Committee members?  6                  MR. BELNICK: If you know.  7                  THE WITNESS: I don't know.  8 BY MS. WEISS:  9                  Q. Who was responsible for compiling the  10 information for review by the Compensation Committee  11 members?  12                  A. All I know about that is that Ken  13 Schroeder and Joy Nyberg would work together to  14 prepare the information.  15                  Q. All right. And how do you know that?  16                  MS. HEINTZ: We object to the extent that  17 it reveals attorney-client communications.  18                  MR. BELNICK: If you know that as a result  19 of something that would involve a client  20 communication -- and I don't know how you could  21 otherwise, but --  22                  THE WITNESS: Yeah. I don't know how I  23 can answer that without revealing a conversation  24 with a client.  25                  MR. BELNICK: And I assume KLA is</p>	<p>Page 167</p> <p>1                  MS. WEISS: Okay. Let's stop. We have to  2 change the tape.  3                  THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off the  4 record. The time is 2:32 p.m. Here marks the end  5 of videotape No. 2, volume 1, in the deposition of  6 Stuart Nichols.  7                 (Off the record.)  8                  THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the  9 record. The time is 2:34 p.m. Here marks the  10 beginning of videotape No. 3, volume 2, in the  11 deposition of Stuart Nichols.  12 BY MS. WEISS:  13                 Q. I believe you said that you recognize the  14 executive summary of stock retention recommendations  15 as part of a report, and I was asking you what you  16 meant by that.  17                 A. Occasionally there was additional  18 attachments or information that was part of the  19 report. And there was also a cover page that the  20 committee members signed at the time of the meeting.  21                 Q. And would the first page of Exhibit 66  22 generally be the form of the page that the  23 Compensation Committee members would sign?  24                 A. No.  25                 Q. Okay. Do you know whether or not minutes</p>

43 (Pages 166 to 169)

Nichols, Stuart J. Esq.

1/27/2008

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 170</p> <p>1 of the November 8th, 2000 Compensation Committee 2 meeting were ever signed? 3 A. I don't know. 4 Q. Who was responsible for getting signatures 5 of Compensation Committee members after the meeting? 6 A. Well, I suppose I ultimately had 7 responsibility. 8 Q. Can you offer any reason as to why these 9 committee minutes -- well, I'm assuming they weren't 10 signed. I don't have a signed copy. 11 Do you know whether or not a signed copy 12 exists of these committee minutes? 13 A. Is that different from your earlier 14 question? 15 MR. BELNICK: Do you know whether there 16 was ever a signed copy of this? 17 THE WITNESS: I thought I already answered 18 that. 19 MR. BELNICK: Answer it again. 20 THE WITNESS: I don't know. 21 BY MS. WEISS: 22 Q. These draft minutes appear to record that 23 the Compensation Committee was to propose that the 24 board approve a nonshareholder-approved plan with 25 certain terms. It's referenced at the middle of the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 172</p> <p>1 Do you recall that approval being made in 2 November of 2000? 3 A. No. 4 Q. Who would have drafted these draft 5 minutes? 6 A. I believe I would have. 7 Q. All right. And so if you created drafts, 8 your intention in creating the draft would have been 9 to reflect what occurred at the meeting; is that 10 right? 11 A. Correct. 12 Q. Okay. In your mind at the time, what 13 further action, if any, was required for the 14 Compensation Committee to make an award to officers 15 of the company other than approving the grants? 16 MR. BELNICK: If you can answer that. 17 MR. FICKES: I'm going to object. That is 18 vague and ambiguous. 19 Do you mean for accounting purposes or 20 just as a matter of internal policy or what? 21 MS. WEISS: Yes. Thank you. 22 BY MS. WEISS: 23 Q. Authorization with grants duly authorized 24 if the Compensation Committee approved them, or did 25 some further action have to be taken in your mind at</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 171</p> <p>1 page. 2 Do you know whether or not the 3 Compensation Committee -- well, strike that. 4 Do you recall discussion of the 5 nonshareholder-approved plan at the Compensation 6 Committee meeting? 7 A. No. 8 Q. Turning back to the first page of the 9 draft, there are a number of clauses which start out 10 as "Whereas." The second whereas says, "Whereas the 11 purpose of this grant is to retain and reward 12 Officers of the Company in the manner that is 13 consistent with the Company's compensation 14 practices." And then it says "Resolved." "The 15 Compensation Committee hereby approves the 16 supplemental grant, the amounts of which 17 supplemental grants will be based on the schedule 18 attached hereto." 19 And then it says, "Resolved further," "The 20 grants will be made under the company's 1982 Stock 21 Option Plan at an exercise price equal to the price 22 listed for the Company's Common Stock on NASDAQ at 23 the close of trading on the date appearing below." 24 And then there is an attachment that shows a 25 schedule of grants.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 173</p> <p>1 that time? 2 MR. BELNICK: Shirli, if we can amend that 3 to -- your question originally was what was in his 4 mind, which poses all kinds of problems. If it was 5 amended to whether he was aware of a procedure that 6 existed at the company that had to -- what was the 7 next step that had to be taken? And that I think 8 will eliminate what may be a potential objection. 9 MS. WEISS: Well, I guess I'd first like 10 to know what his understanding was at that time as 11 general counsel and minute taker. Once the -- once 12 the Compensation Committee approved grants to 13 officers, was there further action necessary for the 14 grants to be awarded? 15 MS. HEINTZ: We're going to object to the 16 extent it requires revelation of any attorney-client 17 communication. 18 THE WITNESS: And on that basis, I don't 19 know how to respond to your question without 20 revealing privileged communications. 21 BY MS. WEISS: 22 Q. Well, let me ask you this, Mr. Nichols. 23 Did you undertake -- when you became the minute 24 taker for the Compensation Committee, did you 25 undertake to educate yourself as to what the charter</p>

44 (Pages 170 to 173)

<p>1 of the Compensation Committee was?</p> <p>2 A. I do have a memory of reviewing the</p> <p>3 charter of the Compensation Committee, yes.</p> <p>4 Q. And did you undertake to educate yourself</p> <p>5 as to the extent of their authority to make grants?</p> <p>6 A. In connection with or prior to this, or</p> <p>7 are you asking in general?</p> <p>8 Q. Well, let me back up. Before you acted as</p> <p>9 secretary for this meeting, had you undertaken to</p> <p>10 become acquainted with the extent of the authority</p> <p>11 of the Compensation Committee?</p> <p>12 A. Yes.</p> <p>13 Q. So did you have an understanding at the</p> <p>14 time that you took the minutes for the November 8th</p> <p>15 meeting as to whether or not all that was required</p> <p>16 for there to be grants to officers was that the</p> <p>17 Compensation Committee could approve them?</p> <p>18 MS. HEINTZ: We're going to object to the</p> <p>19 extent it requires revelation of attorney-client</p> <p>20 communications.</p> <p>21 THE WITNESS: The problem with your</p> <p>22 question is we're sitting here in 2008, and you're</p> <p>23 asking me to tell you what I remember about what my</p> <p>24 state of mind was in November of 2000.</p> <p>25 BY MS. WEISS:</p>	<p>Page 174</p> <p>1 whether what I know now is what I knew then. I</p> <p>2 suspect they are different things.</p> <p>3 BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>4 Q. Well, would you have -- you were also the</p> <p>5 minute taker for the board; right?</p> <p>6 A. Correct.</p> <p>7 Q. And the company was granting options on a</p> <p>8 regular basis; correct?</p> <p>9 MR. FICKES: Objection. Vague as to</p> <p>10 "regular basis."</p> <p>11 DEPOSITION REPORTER: I'm sorry.</p> <p>12 Objection --</p> <p>13 MR. FICKES: Objection. Vague as to</p> <p>14 "regular basis."</p> <p>15 BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>16 Q. More than once a year; correct?</p> <p>17 A. In the 2000 time frame, I just don't</p> <p>18 remember when we started -- when KLA started the</p> <p>19 practice of making options -- oh, you mean for new</p> <p>20 hires?</p> <p>21 Q. No. I'm talking about officers.</p> <p>22 A. Yeah. See, I just don't remember when KLA</p> <p>23 adopted this practice of making grants more than</p> <p>24 just annually.</p> <p>25 Q. Okay. Well, why don't we get the board</p>
<p>1 Q. Yes, I am.</p> <p>2 A. And I just don't remember. I don't know</p> <p>3 what I -- what I knew at that time relative to your</p> <p>4 question, which is about the authority of the</p> <p>5 Compensation Committee to make stock option grants.</p> <p>6 Q. So do you know if someone had asked you in</p> <p>7 November of 2000 whether it was sufficient for</p> <p>8 purposes of authorizing officer grants if the</p> <p>9 Compensation Committee approved them, as you sit</p> <p>10 here today, you can't tell me whether or not you</p> <p>11 would have been able to answer that question in</p> <p>12 November of 2000?</p> <p>13 MR. FICKES: I will object that that calls</p> <p>14 for speculation.</p> <p>15 MS. WEISS: Well, he knows what he knew at</p> <p>16 that time; right?</p> <p>17 BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>18 Q. I mean, you knew what your custom and</p> <p>19 practice was at that time?</p> <p>20 A. No. I'm afraid I --</p> <p>21 MR. BELNICK: He knew then what it was,</p> <p>22 but he's talking about what he knows now, eight</p> <p>23 years later.</p> <p>24 THE WITNESS: I don't know what I knew</p> <p>25 then. I know what I know now, but I don't know</p>	<p>Page 175</p> <p>1 minutes in front of us, too. We've identified the</p> <p>2 Compensation Committee minutes. The board minutes</p> <p>3 are Exhibit 65.</p> <p>4 MS. WEISS: Have I identified those for</p> <p>5 the record? I can't remember.</p> <p>6 MR. BELNICK: Yes, you have.</p> <p>7 BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>8 Q. All right. So if you take a look at</p> <p>9 Exhibit 65, there is minutes of the board on</p> <p>10 November 10th and the Compensation Committee minutes</p> <p>11 on November 8th that are presented in draft that I</p> <p>12 think you testified you prepared. Do you see that?</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 Q. All right. So as to the draft</p> <p>15 Compensation Committee minutes, it provides that,</p> <p>16 "The Compensation Committee hereby approves the</p> <p>17 supplement grant, the amount of which supplemental</p> <p>18 grants will be based on the schedule attached</p> <p>19 hereto." And then there's a schedule showing grants</p> <p>20 to a number of officers.</p> <p>21 And then let's look at the board minutes</p> <p>22 of November 10th, 2000. And on page 2, there's the</p> <p>23 report of the Compensation Committee. Below that it</p> <p>24 states, "Ed Barnholt reported on the results of the</p> <p>25 meeting of the Compensation Committee by summarizing</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 178</p> <p>1 the Executive Summary of the Stock Retention  2 Recommendation attached as Exhibit B." And it says,  3 "The Board discussed, and on motion duly made and  4 seconded, unanimously ratified the actions taken in  5 Exhibit B."</p> <p>6 Do you see that, sir?</p> <p>7 A. Yes.</p> <p>8 Q. All right. And you were the minute taker  9 of the board of directors meeting on November 10th,  10 2000, and that's your signature that appears below;  11 correct?</p> <p>12 A. Yes.</p> <p>13 Q. All right. So were the options to the  14 officers granted on November 8th or November 10th?</p> <p>15 MR. BELNICK: As you recall.</p> <p>16 THE WITNESS: Yeah. So, again, is your  17 question what I remember at the time, or are you  18 asking me to look at these and give you a legal  19 conclusion?</p> <p>20 MR. BELNICK: Right.</p> <p>21 BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>22 Q. At the time, did you believe that the  23 options were granted on November 8th or November  24 10th?</p> <p>25 MR. BELNICK: I think he said -- I think</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 180</p> <p>1 BY MS. WEISS:  2 Q. Can you answer my question?  3 A. Well, yeah, I can, but the problem is it  4 contains a premise that by virtue of the way you're  5 asking the question, the answer is no. I didn't  6 look at the question that you're now posing. Does  7 the Compensation Committee -- if it makes a grant  8 that is ratified by the board, is that a valid  9 grant? No, I don't remember ever looking at that  10 question.</p> <p>11 Q. Okay. So you had no understanding at that  12 time as to whether, at the end of a board meeting  13 that had granted options, whether or not those  14 grants were finally made or you did have an  15 understanding?</p> <p>16 A. No. I think what I've testified to  17 already is that I don't remember what my state of  18 mind was about the authority of these entities that  19 you're now describing, the Compensation Committee  20 and the board, what are -- what were the  21 prerequisites for a valid grant. In terms of my  22 perception back in November of 2000, I don't know my  23 state of mind back then.</p> <p>24 Q. Do you have an understanding now as you  25 look at these documents with hindsight? Do you have</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 179</p> <p>1 he's answered that, but go ahead.</p> <p>2 THE WITNESS: Whether -- I don't know that  3 I've answered that.</p> <p>4 MR. BELNICK: Okay.</p> <p>5 THE WITNESS: But I can tell you I don't  6 have a distinct memory about whether I thought that  7 grants occurred on the 10th, the 8th or would occur  8 at some future date. I truly don't know what my  9 state of mind was back in that time frame.</p> <p>10 BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>11 Q. In 2001 did you undertake to try to  12 ascertain whether or not officer grants that are  13 approved by the Compensation Committee and ratified  14 by the board are made as of the date of the  15 Compensation Committee approval or the board  16 ratification? Would you undertake to look at that  17 issue?</p> <p>18 A. Not that issue, no.</p> <p>19 Q. Did you come to an understanding in 2001  20 as to -- in the scenario I described whether or not  21 the grants were made at the date of the Compensation  22 Committee meeting or the board meeting?</p> <p>23 MR. BELNICK: I know what his problem is  24 going to be in answering that. You limited it to  25 two entities. There may have been another entity.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 181</p> <p>1 an understanding as to when, if at all, the grant to  2 the officers was made in terms of date?</p> <p>3 MR. BELNICK: Objection. I think that's  4 now asking for a legal conclusion --</p> <p>5 MS. WEISS: No. I'm asking him for his  6 understanding. He could be right or wrong, and we  7 can argue about that for ten days. I want his  8 understanding now.</p> <p>9 MS. HEINTZ: We're also objecting on the  10 basis to the extent it reveals attorney-client  11 communications.</p> <p>12 THE WITNESS: And if I may, I think the  13 other problem with your question is are you asking  14 from the standpoint of Delaware corporate law, from  15 the standpoint of accounting standards? I mean,  16 I --</p> <p>17 BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>18 Q. I'm asking from the standpoint of the  19 authority to grant options as applied to KLA.  20 What's your understanding?</p> <p>21 MR. BELNICK: I object. I think -- okay.  22 It's an improper question. The witness has told  23 you, Shirli, one of the problems with it.</p> <p>24 MS. WEISS: I think you need to speak up  25 or I think the record is going to be kind of messy.</p>

<p>1                   MR. BELNICK: What I'm saying is that the  2 witness himself has told you there are different  3 problems -- there are different areas that one can  4 look to answer that question depending on the  5 purpose of the question, whether it was accounting  6 standards or Delaware law for corporate governance  7 or tax standards if it was for the purpose of tax, I  8 suppose. So this is a very broad question.  9                   Secondly, I think whatever understanding  10 he has now of any of those -- well, let me just stop  11 there. It's up to KLA if they have any further  12 problem. But I think that's one of the  13 difficulties, leaving privilege aside, with the  14 breadth of the question.  15                   MS. WEISS: Okay. I think I'm entitled to  16 know what his understanding is now. If his under --  17                   MR. BELNICK: I'm not stopping you.  18                   MS. WEISS: If we establish that his  19 understanding is based on some communication, he can  20 say that and not reveal the communication.  21                   MR. BELNICK: Okay.  22                   MS. WEISS: But I think I'm entitled to  23 understand what his current understanding is as to  24 when the grant would have been made.  25 BY MS. WEISS:</p>	<p>Page 182</p> <p>1 communication.  2                   MR. BELNICK: If you want to ask him, does  3 he have an understanding, then he can answer yes or  4 no. Then if you want to ask him how did he come to  5 that understanding, fine. He can tell you that.  6 But you're starting by asking, unless I'm mishearing  7 the question, what is his understanding. If someone  8 came to him today and said, What's the answer, tell  9 us what's the answer. When you start from there,  10 it's objectionable because there have been  11 privileged communications that would have, I  12 believe, led in part or in whole to that  13 understanding.  14                   MS. WEISS: I disagree with you entirely.  15 I'm entitled to his understanding. You're  16 obstructing the record.  17                   MR. BELNICK: No, I'm not.  18                   MS. WEISS: I've asked the -- I've asked  19 the witness --  20                   MR. BELNICK: I'm trying to facilitate  21 this.  22                   MS. WEISS: If you're going -- if you're  23 going to instruct him not to answer based on  24 attorney-client privilege, then we'll have that as  25 the record. But I've asked him a simple question</p>
<p>1                   Q. Can you answer that?  2                   MS. HEINTZ: To the extent it doesn't  3 reveal attorney-client communication.  4 BY MS. WEISS:  5                   Q. I'm not asking for communication. What's  6 your understanding right now as you look at these  7 documents?  8                   A. Okay. So --  9                   Q. If somebody asked you right now, these  10 grants were approved by the Compensation Committee.  11 They were ratified by the board two days later.  12 Mr. Nichols, what's your current understanding as to  13 the date of grant? What would you say?  14                   MR. FICKES: I would object on relevance  15 grounds, and that calls for a legal conclusion.  16                   MR. BELNICK: I would object on more than  17 that. That definitely -- that understanding would  18 be based on, among other things, communications that  19 Mr. Nichols had with me and other of his lawyers.  20                   MS. WEISS: I don't care what it's based  21 on. I'm not asking for the communication. I want  22 to know what his current understanding is, and then  23 I'm going to ask him how he came to that  24 understanding. If that understanding then has to do  25 with communication, I don't want to know about the</p>	<p>Page 183</p> <p>1 that I think is highly relevant.  2                   MR. BELNICK: Can I voir -- can I just  3 voir dire him?  4                   MS. WEISS: You can go and have a meeting  5 with him if you would like.  6                   MR. BELNICK: No. I'm just -- I'm trying  7 to facilitate it, Shirli. Ask him -- can't we start  8 by asking him, A, do you have an understanding? B,  9 how did you come to the understand? Then we will  10 know, all of us, whether there is a foundation to  11 object to C, which is, what is the understanding?  12 I'm not obstructing; I'm trying to get it done so  13 that we don't sit here and argue. I don't want to  14 argue. He's a percipient witness. He has no stake  15 other than to answer the questions to the extent  16 they don't involve a privilege.  17 BY MS. WEISS:  18                   Q. Can you answer the question that I posed,  19 Mr. Nichols?  20                   MR. BELNICK: Could you repeat it to him,  21 please.  22 BY MS. WEISS:  23                   Q. As you look at these documents today, do  24 you have an understanding as to whether or not the  25 grant that we've been referring to was made under</p>

Nichols, Stuart J. Esq.

1/27/2008

<p>1 these facts on November 8th or November 10th?  2 MR. BELNICK: You can answer that.  3 MS. HEINTZ: Well, we're going to also  4 instruct not to answer if it is based on an  5 attorney-client communication.  6 MR. BELNICK: Then you follow KLA's  7 direction.  8 THE WITNESS: Without relying on  9 privileged communications, my opinion would be  10 that --  11 MR. BELNICK: No. The question was do you  12 have an understanding, not what is it.  13 THE WITNESS: Okay. I think it was do I  14 have an opinion. Do I have an understanding? Yes,  15 I have an understanding.  16 BY MS. WEISS:  17 Q. Okay. And what is it?  18 MS. HEINTZ: We're going to object again,  19 to the extent it's based on an attorney-client  20 communication, not to answer that question.  21 MR. FICKES: And I'll object again on  22 relevance grounds.  23 THE WITNESS: Okay. So without relying on  24 attorney-client information, my understanding  25 looking at these documents is that at a validly</p>	<p>Page 186</p> <p>1 question, you said does the committee charter  2 delegate to the Compensation Committee? I don't  3 think you meant that.  4 BY MS. WEISS:  5 Q. Does the committee charter empower the  6 Compensation Committee?  7 A. Which committee? Which committee charter?  8 Q. Does the Compensation Committee charter  9 empower the Compensation Committee to make officer  10 grants?  11 A. Yes.  12 Q. All right. Now, at KLA Tencor in November  13 of 2000, who was responsible for properly accounting  14 for stock options to officers?  15 A. Which individual or which department?  16 Q. Let's start with the individual, and then  17 we'll go to the department.  18 A. Well, ultimately, at that time John  19 Kispert was the -- was the CFO, so he would be  20 ultimately responsible for the proper accounting of  21 the stock -- of any accounting matter.  22 Q. Including accounting for stock options  23 granted to officers; is that correct?  24 A. Correct.  25 Q. And Mr. Kispert had access to the</p>
<p>Page 187</p> <p>1 composed meeting of the Compensation Committee which  2 has authority to make grants, there were minutes  3 that were executed that indicated all of the  4 elements that would be necessary from an accounting  5 standpoint to make a grant to officers, namely, the  6 individuals, the number of the grant -- of the  7 options to each individual, the date upon which it  8 was to be priced and all the terms.  9 So I would say that on the 8th, there was  10 a valid grant.  11 BY MS. WEISS:  12 Q. All right. And is it your belief that KLA  13 Tencor's Compensation Committee charter delegated to  14 the Compensation Committee the authority to make  15 grants, or are you relying on some other source for  16 that understanding?  17 A. Can you read back the question.  18 (Record read as follows:  19 "Question: And is it your belief that  20 KLA Tencor's committee charter delegated  21 to the Compensation Committee the  22 authority to make grants, or are you  23 relying on some other source for that  24 understanding?")  25 THE WITNESS: So if I understand your</p>	<p>Page 189</p> <p>1 Compensation Committee minutes of the company  2 whenever he wanted them; correct?  3 A. Correct.  4 Q. He also had access to the board of  5 directors minutes whenever he wanted them; correct?  6 A. Correct.  7 Q. Take a look at the second page of the  8 report where -- first, the supplemental stock award  9 for officers.  10 Okay. The first paragraph states,  11 "Background: A supplemental grant equal to half the  12 recent 'Peak' grant with a 5 year vest was recently  13 approved for all eligible employees in order to  14 increase retention. Additionally, certain employees  15 with options at \$55 a share or greater were given a  16 surrender option for those grants. Prior to this  17 supplemental grant 50% of optionees were underwater  18 at the market price of \$30 a share and turnover of  19 the company was increasing as the stock price was  20 declining."  21 Do you see that?  22 A. Yes.  23 Q. And then it says, "Officers are to be  24 awarded grants from the Shareholder Approved plan  25 under the same program used for the employees. See</p>

48 (Pages 186 to 189)

<p>1 attached for full detail."</p> <p>2 Can you tell me what it meant in the</p> <p>3 minutes when you said, "Officers are to be awarded</p> <p>4 grants from the Shareholder Approved plan under the</p> <p>5 same program used for employees"? What employee --</p> <p>6 what program was being referred to?</p> <p>7 A. I'm sorry. Can you refer me to the</p> <p>8 language that --</p> <p>9 Q. Beside "Recommendation," it says,</p> <p>10 "Officers are to be awarded grants from the</p> <p>11 Shareholder Approved plan under the same program</p> <p>12 used for employees."</p> <p>13 A. You said when I said this.</p> <p>14 Q. Well, you created -- are these not --</p> <p>15 MR. BELNICK: This is the report.</p> <p>16 THE WITNESS: I did not create this</p> <p>17 document.</p> <p>18 MS. WEISS: Oh, okay. That's right.</p> <p>19 Thank you for the correction.</p> <p>20 BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>21 Q. Do you have -- can you tell me what "the</p> <p>22 same program used for employees" is a reference to</p> <p>23 in those minutes?</p> <p>24 A. I can't interpret those words any better</p> <p>25 than you can.</p>	<p>Page 190</p> <p>1 you don't have a signed draft, and apparently</p> <p>2 there's a question about whether a signed draft even</p> <p>3 occurred. I don't know as I sit here today whether</p> <p>4 I prepared this in advance, whether the meeting was</p> <p>5 consistent with that.</p> <p>6 Having said that, I think the words speak</p> <p>7 relatively clearly for themselves.</p> <p>8 Q. All right. So if this draft properly</p> <p>9 reflects what actually occurred at the Compensation</p> <p>10 Committee meeting, the Compensation Committee</p> <p>11 approved grants made to officers under the 1982</p> <p>12 stock option plan; correct?</p> <p>13 A. Correct.</p> <p>14 Q. And also approved a recommendation of</p> <p>15 management for a supplemental option grant to</p> <p>16 nonofficer employees; correct?</p> <p>17 A. That appears to be the case, yes.</p> <p>18 Q. Okay. And then the board on -- two days</p> <p>19 later ratified the actions of the Compensation</p> <p>20 Committee; correct?</p> <p>21 A. Correct.</p> <p>22 MS. WEISS: Let's take a look at the</p> <p>23 Compensation Committee charter. Do you know what</p> <p>24 that is?</p> <p>25 MR. FICKES: Shirli, would this be a good</p>
<p>1 Q. All right. Thank you.</p> <p>2 All right. On the first page of the</p> <p>3 minutes, at the bottom it says, "The Compensation</p> <p>4 Committee also reviewed and approved actions</p> <p>5 recommended by management of the company regarding</p> <p>6 the issuance of a supplemental option grant to</p> <p>7 nonofficer employees."</p> <p>8 Do you see that? That's right above the</p> <p>9 word "Draft."</p> <p>10 MR. BELNICK: The first sentence after the</p> <p>11 last "resolved further" clause.</p> <p>12 THE WITNESS: Yeah. Yeah. I see that.</p> <p>13 Okay. I'm sorry. The question is?</p> <p>14 BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>15 Q. Do you see that phrase?</p> <p>16 A. I see that, yeah.</p> <p>17 Q. Okay. So -- and you recorded that as --</p> <p>18 in the draft of the Compensation Committee minutes</p> <p>19 of November 8th, 2000; correct?</p> <p>20 A. Yes. Correct.</p> <p>21 Q. All right. So the action taken by the</p> <p>22 Compensation Committee in that paragraph related not</p> <p>23 to officers, but to nonofficer employees; correct?</p> <p>24 A. Well, assuming that in fact these are the</p> <p>25 actions of the committee. You've pointed out that</p>	<p>Page 191</p> <p>1 time for a break?</p> <p>2 MS. WEISS: Sure.</p> <p>3 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Off the record. The</p> <p>4 time is 3:04 p.m.</p> <p>5 (Off the record.)</p> <p>6 (Whereupon, Exhibit 67 was marked</p> <p>7 for identification off the record.)</p> <p>8 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Back on the record.</p> <p>9 The time is 3:25 p.m.</p> <p>10 BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>11 Q. Okay. Mr. Nichols, so before the break we</p> <p>12 were talking about Exhibit 66, which was the minutes</p> <p>13 of the November 8th, 2000 Compensation Committee</p> <p>14 meeting, the draft minutes. Those -- the draft</p> <p>15 minutes, if correct, reflect that the Compensation</p> <p>16 Committee approved supplemental grants to KLA</p> <p>17 Tencor's officers and also reviewed and approved</p> <p>18 actions recommended by management of the company</p> <p>19 regarding the issuance of supplemental option grants</p> <p>20 to nonofficers.</p> <p>21 Then if we look at Exhibit 65, which is</p> <p>22 the minutes of the board of directors -- and these I</p> <p>23 believe are signed by you -- they reflect a</p> <p>24 presentation by Mr. Barnholt, a member of the</p> <p>25 Compensation Committee, of the results of the</p>

Nichols, Stuart J. Esq.

1/27/2008

<p>1 meeting of the Compensation Committee and the  2 approval of those actions by the board of directors.  3 And I believe you said -- your  4 understanding is that the Compensation Committee  5 could make the grants I just described to the  6 officers without ratification or approval by the  7 board. Did I get that right?  8 A. Yes.  9 Q. Was it -- is it your understanding that  10 the Compensation Committee could approve the  11 recommendations of management with respect to the  12 nonofficers without ratification of the board?  13 A. You know, I don't have a specific  14 understanding about that, about the comp committee  15 approving actions of management. I -- yeah. I  16 don't have an understanding about that.  17 Q. Okay. But you do agree that that's  18 reflected in the Compensation Committee minutes?  19 A. Yes.  20 Q. Okay. As to your understanding about the  21 need or lack of need for ratification by the board,  22 if you would just take a look at the charter of the  23 Compensation Committee. That is attached as Exhibit  24 B-2 to Exhibit 67. Exhibit 67 is Bates stamped  25 MLB/KLA-SEC00050391 through 50458.</p>	<p>Page 194</p> <p>1 with me here.  2 MR. BELNICK: No. I understand.  3 BY MS. WEISS:  4 Q. So as I understand it, the company,  5 conditioned on the merger, adopted amended charters  6 for the Compensation, Audit and Nominating  7 Committee. That's reflected on page 3 of these  8 minutes. The charter for the Compensation Committee  9 is attached as B-2.  10 First of all, during your tenure at KLA  11 Tencor, sir, did you have occasion to review the  12 Compensation Committee charter?  13 A. Yes.  14 Q. All right. And I think earlier you  15 testified that your current understanding is that  16 the Compensation Committee was empowered to make  17 officer grants without ratification by the board.  18 We referred to the Compensation Committee charter.  19 This is I believe the charter of KLA Tencor's  20 Compensation Committee. It's not that long.  21 Could you please review it and tell me  22 what section you're relying on in your understanding  23 of what you testified to that the Compensation  24 Committee could make a grant to officers without  25 approval of the board?</p>
<p>Page 195</p> <p>1 MR. BELNICK: Where will we find B-2? I  2 only have Exhibit D.  3 MS. WEISS: Yeah. I'll tell you in a  4 minute. The compilation is the minutes of the  5 meeting of the board of directors of KLA Instruments  6 Corporation April 28th, 1997.  7 MR. BELNICK: Oh, B-2. I see.  8 MS. WEISS: And the charter commences on  9 Bates stamp 50408 --  10 MR. BELNICK: Through 10.  11 MS. WEISS: Excuse me just a minute.  12 All right. These minutes appear to  13 reflect actions taken in anticipation of the merger  14 of KLA Instruments with Tencor Corporation. And one  15 of those actions is the appointment of new members,  16 amendment of charters for the Audit, Compensation  17 and Nominating Committee. That reference is on page  18 3 toward the bottom.  19 MR. BELNICK: Just so the record is clear,  20 Shirli, this is a meeting that took place before  21 Mr. Nichols joined the company.  22 MS. WEISS: Yes. I'm just laying a  23 foundation --  24 MR. BELNICK: I understand.  25 MS. WEISS: -- for the charter, so bear</p>	<p>Page 197</p> <p>1 A. Is this the charter that was in effect  2 in -- this is a meeting dated April '97. Is this  3 the charter that was in effect in 2000, the time  4 frame about which you're asking me?  5 Q. That's my understanding. And your  6 testimony is subject to that representation.  7 A. Okay.  8 Q. That's my understanding.  9 A. It would appear to me that paragraph 6  10 contains that authority.  11 Q. All right. And so paragraph 6  12 cross-references the 1982 stock option plan?  13 A. Yes.  14 Q. And it also refers to authority delegated  15 by the board of directors to grant stock options or  16 stock purchase rights to individuals eligible for  17 such grants, including grants to individuals subject  18 to section 16 of the Securities Exchange Act of  19 1934. That would be officers; correct?  20 A. Correct.  21 Q. All right. Is it your belief that that  22 authority is delegated by virtue of this paragraph  23 and requires no additional delegation? That  24 would -- would that be your interpretation of this  25 provision?</p>

50 (Pages 194 to 197)

Nichols, Stuart J. Esq.

1/27/2008

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 198</p> <p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 MS. WEISS: Now I'm going to jump ahead in</p> <p>3 time to the time period just before the March 2001</p> <p>4 memorandum that we referred to earlier.</p> <p>5 (Off the record.)</p> <p>6 MS. WEISS: Okay. I'm going to mark a</p> <p>7 number of exhibits in connection with what we'll</p> <p>8 call the March 2001 memo. So if you'll just bear</p> <p>9 with me. I'll handle -- I'll hand them to you one</p> <p>10 after another, and then I'll ask you a few</p> <p>11 questions.</p> <p>12 And we're now at Exhibit --</p> <p>13 DEPOSITION REPORTER: 68.</p> <p>14 MS. WEISS: Okay. 68.</p> <p>15 (Whereupon, Exhibit 68 was marked</p> <p>16 for identification.)</p> <p>17 MS. WEISS: 69; 70; 71; 72; 73; 74; 75;</p> <p>18 76; 77; 78; 79; 80; 81.</p> <p>19 (Whereupon, Exhibits 69, 70, 71, 72, 73,</p> <p>20 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80 and 81 were</p> <p>21 marked for identification.)</p> <p>22 MS. WEISS: I think Exhibit 76 is the only</p> <p>23 one I need for this group. Did you already give me</p> <p>24 that? Thanks.</p> <p>25 What's next, 82? 82.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 200</p> <p>1 Q. And you sent a copy to Maureen Lamb with</p> <p>2 the expectation that she would read it?</p> <p>3 A. Well, to all of them with that</p> <p>4 expectation.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay. And you sent it to Mr. Kispert with</p> <p>6 the expectation that he would read it?</p> <p>7 A. Yes.</p> <p>8 Q. And you sent it to Joy Nyberg with the</p> <p>9 expectation that she would read it?</p> <p>10 A. Yes. Well, actually, let me clarify. I</p> <p>11 sent it to Ken Schroeder with the expectation that</p> <p>12 he would read it. I copied Maureen, John and Joy</p> <p>13 because I wanted to -- them to know that I had</p> <p>14 written it. So I don't know that I can say that I</p> <p>15 expected them to read it. I mean, any time you're</p> <p>16 copied on something, you know, you should. But I</p> <p>17 think my primary motivation was to just make them</p> <p>18 aware of what I was communicating to Ken.</p> <p>19 Q. And the way that they would be aware of it</p> <p>20 would be that they would read it; correct?</p> <p>21 A. Right.</p> <p>22 Q. All right. Now, as I understand your</p> <p>23 instruction from counsel, you're going to refuse to</p> <p>24 testify with respect to this memorandum on the</p> <p>25 grounds of attorney-client privilege. Is that</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 199</p> <p>1 (Whereupon, Exhibit 82 was marked</p> <p>2 for identification.)</p> <p>3 BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>4 Q. Okay. So, Mr. Nichols, the court reporter</p> <p>5 had handed you what's been marked as Exhibits 68</p> <p>6 through 82. Take a look at Exhibit 77. Can you</p> <p>7 identify that exhibit?</p> <p>8 A. Yes.</p> <p>9 Q. What is it?</p> <p>10 A. This is a memo that I prepared directed --</p> <p>11 that I gave to Ken Schroeder.</p> <p>12 Q. The date on it is March 19th, 2001. The</p> <p>13 Bates stamp is KT ACWP-PRIV00002391 to 2394 -- I'm</p> <p>14 sorry -- 95. It's a memorandum marked "Privileged</p> <p>15 and Confidential," addressed to Ken Schroeder from</p> <p>16 Stu Nichols with copies to Maureen Lamb, John</p> <p>17 Kispert and Joy Nyberg, "Re: Stock Option Pricing."</p> <p>18 Do you see that, sir?</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 Q. You sent that to Mr. Schroeder on March</p> <p>21 19th, 2001?</p> <p>22 A. Yes.</p> <p>23 Q. And you sent copies to Maureen Lamb, John</p> <p>24 Kispert and Joy Nyberg as shown?</p> <p>25 A. Yes.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 201</p> <p>1 correct?</p> <p>2 MS. HEINTZ: That's correct.</p> <p>3 BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>4 Q. Okay. And I think you've already</p> <p>5 testified that you did not prepare the memorandum in</p> <p>6 anticipation of litigation; correct?</p> <p>7 A. Correct.</p> <p>8 Q. And is it the company's position that it</p> <p>9 will instruct Ms. Lamb, Mr. Kispert, Joy Nyberg and</p> <p>10 Mr. Schroeder not to testify with respect to this</p> <p>11 communication from the general counsel Stu Nichols?</p> <p>12 MS. HEINTZ: We're prepared to instruct</p> <p>13 with respect to Mr. Nichols at this time. We can</p> <p>14 discuss other applications of the privilege after</p> <p>15 the deposition.</p> <p>16 MS. WEISS: And so is it your statement</p> <p>17 that you will not commit on the record at this time</p> <p>18 as to whether or not you will instruct the people</p> <p>19 that I mentioned that are addressees of this</p> <p>20 memorandum not to testify?</p> <p>21 MS. HEINTZ: With respect to this</p> <p>22 memorandum, we would instruct them not to testify.</p> <p>23 MS. WEISS: Okay. So it is the company's</p> <p>24 position that none of these people will be permitted</p> <p>25 to testify with respect to Exhibit 77 should they be</p>

51 (Pages 198 to 201)

Nichols, Stuart J. Esq.

1/27/2008

<p>1 called as witnesses, including Mr. Schroeder?  2 MS. HEINTZ: Yes.  3 MS. WEISS: What number -- what was the  4 next number?  5 DEPOSITION REPORTER: 83.  6 (Whereupon, Exhibit 83 was marked  7 for identification.)  8 BY MS. WEISS:  9 Q. Mr. Nichols, Exhibit 83 is a copy of the  10 complaint filed in the United States District Court  11 for the Northern District of California, San Jose  12 Division, by the Securities and Exchange Commission  13 as plaintiff against my client, Kenneth L.  14 Schroeder, on July -- I think it's 25th, 2007.  15 Please review as much of the complaint as  16 you need to to respond to my questions. But I'm  17 going to direct your attention to paragraph 29 under  18 the heading "C., in a March 2001 memorandum  19 Schroeder receives legal advice that he cannot  20 retroactively set stock prices," paragraphs 29, 30,  21 31, 32 and 33.  22 MR. BELNICK: This is not for the record.  23 But, Shirli, where was the paragraph that you read  24 that line from?  25 MS. WEISS: It's the heading on page 7 in</p>	<p>Page 202</p> <p>1 of Exhibit 78 is an email from Mr. Schroeder to you  2 dated March 22nd, 2001, which appears to be  3 responding to Exhibit 77. Do you see that, sir?  4 A. Uh-huh. Yes.  5 Q. Take a moment and tell me, if you can, if  6 you believe that the allegations in paragraph 33 are  7 a reference to Exhibit 78.  8 A. Yes, it would appear so.  9 MS. WEISS: Miss Heintz, is it the  10 company's position that it will instruct Mr. Nichols  11 not to testify with respect to Exhibit 78 on the  12 grounds of the attorney-client privilege?  13 MS. HEINTZ: Yes.  14 MS. WEISS: Is that the company's position  15 with respect to the individuals identified on  16 Exhibit 77?  17 MS. HEINTZ: Well, they are not identified  18 as recipients of No. 78.  19 MS. WEISS: Yes. But to the extent that I  20 ask them questions about Mr. Schroeder's response,  21 would the company's position be the same? That is  22 to say --  23 MS. HEINTZ: To the extent they would  24 reveal attorney-client communications, yes.  25 MS. WEISS: Would you permit them to</p>
<p>1 the middle of the page.  2 MR. BELNICK: I see. Okay. Thanks.  3 (Discussion off the record between  4 Deponent and Counsel.)  5 MR. BELNICK: Shirli, I'll ask if you want  6 or you may ask, but I think it would be helpful to  7 establish whether the witness has ever read this  8 complaint before today.  9 MS. WEISS: Sure, I can ask that question.  10 MR. BELNICK: You can ask it.  11 BY MS. WEISS:  12 Q. Have you ever read this complaint before  13 today?  14 A. No.  15 Q. All right. Have you had a chance to read  16 the paragraphs that I referenced?  17 A. Yes.  18 Q. All right. Can you tell me, Mr. Nichols,  19 if you believe that the reference to paragraph 31  20 and 32 in this complaint is a reference to Exhibit  21 77?  22 A. It appears to be a reference to that  23 exhibit, yes.  24 Q. All right. Thank you.  25 Take a look at Exhibit 78. The lower part</p>	<p>Page 203</p> <p>1 respond to questions that did not involve reference  2 to Mr. Nichols' memo?  3 MS. HEINTZ: We would have to determine  4 that on a case-by-case basis.  5 MS. WEISS: But as to communications that  6 in any way touched upon Mr. Nichols' communication,  7 you would instruct them not to answer. Is that your  8 position?  9 MS. HEINTZ: If they are communications  10 with Mr. Nichols, yes.  11 MS. WEISS: Only if they are  12 communications with Mr. Nichols?  13 MS. HEINTZ: Or to the extent they are  14 about communications of Mr. Nichols.  15 MS. WEISS: So if Mr. Kispert and  16 Mr. Schroeder had a conversation about Mr. Nichols'  17 memorandum, would you instruct both of those  18 individuals not to respond -- not to answer my  19 questions based on the attorney-client privilege?  20 MS. HEINTZ: We'd have to determine that  21 based on the question and the context.  22 MS. WEISS: So it depends on how the  23 question is asked whether or not they could respond  24 to the question about Mr. Nichols --  25 MS. HEINTZ: Or what the subject matter of</p>

52 (Pages 202 to 205)

Nichols, Stuart J. Esq.

1/27/2008

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 206</p> <p>1 the question is.</p> <p>2 MS. WEISS: I'm assuming that the subject</p> <p>3 matter of the question is Mr. Nichols' memo. Take</p> <p>4 that as the assumption. I'm just trying to shortcut</p> <p>5 a bunch of depositions here.</p> <p>6 MS. HEINTZ: I understand.</p> <p>7 MS. WEISS: Would you instruct</p> <p>8 Mr. Schroeder and Mr. Kispert not to respond if the</p> <p>9 questions were posed about Mr. Nichols'</p> <p>10 communications to Mr. Schroeder?</p> <p>11 MS. HEINTZ: Yes.</p> <p>12 MS. WEISS: And would that be your</p> <p>13 position with respect to questions posed by the SEC</p> <p>14 as well as Mr. Schroeder's counsel or only</p> <p>15 Mr. Schroeder's counsel?</p> <p>16 MS. HEINTZ: No with respect to both.</p> <p>17 MS. WEISS: Okay. So if the SEC asks</p> <p>18 questions of Mr. Nichols about Exhibit 77 and 78,</p> <p>19 you would instruct him not to answer. Same thing</p> <p>20 with all these other people that are cc'd on the</p> <p>21 memorandum that is Exhibit 77; correct?</p> <p>22 MS. HEINTZ: Yes.</p> <p>23 MS. WEISS: Okay. So I propose that we</p> <p>24 leave a blank in the record here for the listing of</p> <p>25 each of these exhibits, and then I ask some group</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 208</p> <p>1 question that I might pose to Mr. Nichols with</p> <p>2 respect to these communications, other than</p> <p>3 identifying himself as either a sender, a recipient</p> <p>4 of these communications, would your instruction to</p> <p>5 him to be not to respond to my questions based on</p> <p>6 the attorney-client privilege?</p> <p>7 MS. HEINTZ: Well, 68 -- Mr. Nichols is</p> <p>8 not a recipient of the emails in Exhibit 68.</p> <p>9 MS. WEISS: Okay. Let me just get that in</p> <p>10 front of me here.</p> <p>11 You are correct.</p> <p>12 Would you -- well, that's a good point.</p> <p>13 Let's look at Exhibit 68.</p> <p>14 BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>15 Q. Exhibit 68 is an email from Mr. Coffey to</p> <p>16 Joy Nyberg asking in the first sentence, "Joy, Ken</p> <p>17 Schroeder sent me an email asking if the comp</p> <p>18 committee meeting had been scheduled," and then it</p> <p>19 goes on.</p> <p>20 During the time period referred to in this</p> <p>21 email, March of 2001, who normally set comp</p> <p>22 committee meetings? Who normally arranged for a</p> <p>23 comp committee meeting that had not been</p> <p>24 prescheduled?</p> <p>25 A. I believe that my assistant would do that.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 207</p> <p>1 questions of Mr. Nichols to establish the assertion</p> <p>2 of the privilege. Shall we do that?</p> <p>3 MR. BELNICK: That sounds good to me.</p> <p>4 MS. WEISS: I'll be happy to recite all</p> <p>5 this stuff, but you might be asleep at the end of</p> <p>6 it.</p> <p>7 MR. BELNICK: Heaven forbid. I mean,</p> <p>8 unless the SEC objects --</p> <p>9 MR. FICKES: We don't.</p> <p>10 MR. BELNICK: -- it sounds like --</p> <p>11 MS. WEISS: You're okay with that? All</p> <p>12 right. So we'll ask -- we'll identify them for the</p> <p>13 court reporter.</p> <p>14 BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>15 Q. But I'm going to ask you, Mr. Nichols, as</p> <p>16 to each of the exhibits that I have identified,</p> <p>17 numbers --</p> <p>18 MR. BELNICK: 68 through --</p> <p>19 MS. WEISS: -- 68 through 83 --</p> <p>20 MR. FICKES: Do you mean the complaint?</p> <p>21 MS. WEISS: 82. 68 through 82.</p> <p>22 MR. BELNICK: Everything but the</p> <p>23 complaint.</p> <p>24 MS. WEISS: And, Miss Heintz, this is</p> <p>25 probably more of a question for you. As to any</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 209</p> <p>1 Q. All right. Do you recall during this time</p> <p>2 period Mr. Schroeder asking that a comp committee</p> <p>3 meeting be scheduled?</p> <p>4 A. No.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay. Ms. Nyberg responds, "I have not</p> <p>6 tried to schedule a date as we were to get</p> <p>7 confirmation from Stu regarding the pricing of the</p> <p>8 extra supplemental grant for section 16 officers."</p> <p>9 And she goes on.</p> <p>10 Is there anything about her email back</p> <p>11 that refreshes your recollection that in early March</p> <p>12 of 2001, Mr. Schroeder requested that a comp</p> <p>13 committee meeting be scheduled?</p> <p>14 A. No.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. Exhibit 69. Did you send the email</p> <p>16 dated March 13th, 2001 to Roger Stern with a copy to</p> <p>17 Mr. DiMarco as represented by that exhibit?</p> <p>18 A. It appears I did, yes.</p> <p>19 Q. You have no reason to believe that you did</p> <p>20 not?</p> <p>21 A. That's correct.</p> <p>22 Q. All right.</p> <p>23 MS. HEINTZ: Wait a second. I don't have</p> <p>24 a copy of 69.</p> <p>25 MS. WEISS: We'll supply you with a copy.</p>

53 (Pages 206 to 209)

Nichols, Stuart J. Esq.

1/27/2008

Page 210	Page 212
<p>1        MR. BELNICK: It's not a big point,  2 Shirli, but I just will point out that 69 is  3 addressed to both Stern and DiMarco as opposed to  4 just Stern with a copy to DiMarco.</p> <p>5        MS. WEISS: Yes. Thank you. You're  6 right.</p> <p>7        BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>8        Q. Okay. Exhibit 70 is an email chain,  9 beginning with an email dated March 13th, 2001 from  10 Joy Nyberg to Stuart Nichols and Maureen Lamb --</p> <p>11        MR. BELNICK: You said it's from all three  12 of them. I think you just wanted --</p> <p>13        MS. WEISS: I'm sorry. From Joy Nyberg to  14 Stuart Nichols and Maureen Lamb.</p> <p>15        BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>16        Q. Is that right?</p> <p>17        A. Yes.</p> <p>18        MR. FICKES: Are you looking at the  19 original message?</p> <p>20        MS. WEISS: Let's start over. The  21 original message is --</p> <p>22        MR. BELNICK: That's the one at the  23 bottom. You go from the bottom up.</p> <p>24        MR. FICKES: Right.</p> <p>25        BY MS. WEISS:</p>	<p>1        in red or any other color.</p> <p>2        MS. WEISS: Thank you for that</p> <p>3 clarification.</p> <p>4        BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>5        Q. If you take a look at the second page of  6 Exhibit 70, there appears to be a notation under  7 "Stock Option Committee" which starts in  8 parentheses "(Stu)" and then a comment. And then in  9 the next paragraph there is another notation in  10 parentheses that says "(Stu)" and then a sentence.</p> <p>11        Do you have an understanding as you look  12 at this as to whose comments -- as to whether or not  13 those are comments by a person other than yourself?  14 Wait a minute.</p> <p>15        Do you believe that those are comments by  16 a person on your message other than yourself?</p> <p>17        A. Yes. I wouldn't use my own name to make  18 comments to myself.</p> <p>19        Q. Yes, one would hope. It would be strange.</p> <p>20        Do you think those are Miss Nyberg's comments?</p> <p>21        A. Yes, I do.</p> <p>22        Q. All right. Okay. Exhibit 71 is an email  23 from Bret DiMarco dated March 13th, 2001 to Stuart  24 J. Nichols and Roger Stern with an attachment.</p> <p>25        Do you have any reason to believe that you</p>
<p>1        Q. The original message appears to be an  2 email from Stuart Nichols sent March 12th, 2001, to  3 Joy Nyberg and Maureen Lamb, with a response from  4 Joy Nyberg dated March 13th, 2001 to Stuart Nichols  5 and Maureen Lamb, and a further email from Stuart  6 Nichols to Maureen Lamb and Joy Nyberg dated March  7 13th, 2001.</p> <p>8        MR. BELNICK: In between is the one from  9 Lamb.</p> <p>10        MS. WEISS: You're right. In between  11 there is one from Lamb dated March 13th, 2001  12 addressed to Joy Nyberg and Stuart Nichols.</p> <p>13        MR. BELNICK: Right.</p> <p>14        BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>15        Q. This email chain represented by Exhibit  16 70, do you have any reason to believe that you were  17 not the sender and recipient as shown on this email  18 string?</p> <p>19        A. No, I don't have any reason to believe  20 that I was not.</p> <p>21        MR. BELNICK: And for the clarity of your  22 record, Shirli, going up the message from  23 Miss Nyberg to Nichols and Lamb it says, "See my  24 comments below in red." I think we can agree that  25 this exhibit as marked doesn't indicate any comments</p>	<p>1        did not receive Exhibit 71?</p> <p>2        A. No.</p> <p>3        Q. Exhibit 72 is an email from you to Joy  4 Nyberg dated March 14th, 2001, and there's an  5 attachment that is a draft -- what appears to be a  6 draft of Exhibit 77 dated March 14th, 2001.</p> <p>7        Do you believe that you sent Exhibit 72?</p> <p>8        A. Yes.</p> <p>9        Q. Exhibit 73 is an email dated March 14th,  10 2001, from Roger Stern to Stuart Nichols with copies  11 to Bret DiMarco and Celina Lopez.</p> <p>12        Do you have any reason to believe that you  13 did not receive Exhibit 73 from Mr. Stern?</p> <p>14        A. No.</p> <p>15        Q. Who is Celina Lopez?</p> <p>16        A. I haven't the foggiest idea.</p> <p>17        Q. Okay. Exhibit 74. The original message  18 on Exhibit 74 is an email from Bret DiMarco sent  19 Tuesday, March 13th, 2001, to Stuart Nichols and  20 Roger Stern, a response by you dated March 14th,  21 2001, to Bret DiMarco and Roger Stern, and a  22 response to that memo by Bret DiMarco dated March  23 14th, 2001, to you with an attached draft apparently  24 of Exhibit 77.</p> <p>25        Do you have any reason to doubt that you</p>

54 (Pages 210 to 213)

Nichols, Stuart J. Esq.

1/27/2008

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 214</p> <p>1 were a sender and recipient as shown on the various  2 emails in Exhibit 74?</p> <p>3 A. I have no reason to doubt that.</p> <p>4 Q. Exhibit 75 is an email chain -- by the  5 way, who is Monica Torres? Is she just the person  6 who printed out these emails, do you think, or you  7 have no idea?</p> <p>8 A. I have no idea.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay. Exhibit 75 is an email chain from  10 Roger Stern to Stuart Nichols. It copies Bret  11 DiMarco and Celina Lopez, and a response dated March  12 14th, 2001, from Roger Stern to Stuart Nichols,  13 copied to DiMarco and Celina Lopez, and then a  14 response to that message dated March 14th, 2001,  15 from Bret DiMarco to Roger Stern and Stuart Nichols.</p> <p>16 Do you have any reason to believe -- and  17 it has an attachment of a draft of Exhibit 77.</p> <p>18 Do you have any reason to believe that you  19 were not a sender and recipient as shown on this  20 Exhibit 75?</p> <p>21 A. No, I have no reason to believe that.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. Exhibit 76 is an email chain from  23 Roger Stern dated March 14th, 2001, to Stuart  24 Nichols, copies to Bret DiMarco and Celina Lopez.  25 And there is a response from Celina Lopez dated</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 216</p> <p>1 A. Yeah. Presumably I did.</p> <p>2 Q. You don't recall the -- you don't recall  3 doing that?</p> <p>4 A. No.</p> <p>5 Q. And can we conclude that if you sent  6 Mr. Kispert this message from Mr. Schroeder, you  7 expected him to read it?</p> <p>8 A. Yes.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay. Exhibit 79 is an email chain. It  10 starts with Mr. Schroeder's message to you dated  11 March 22nd, 2001, and it appears to be forwarded by  12 you to Roger Stern and Bret DiMarco. Is that  13 correct, sir? You forwarded Mr. Schroeder's message  14 to outside counsel Roger Stern and Bret DiMarco?</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 Q. Exhibit 80 begins with Mr. Schroeder's  17 email to you of March 22nd, 2001, which is  18 apparently forwarded by you on March 22nd, 2001, to  19 Roger Stern and Bret DiMarco with a message, to  20 which Mr. Roger Stern responds on March 22nd, 2001,  21 to yourself and Mr. DiMarco. Is that correct?</p> <p>22 A. Correct.</p> <p>23 Q. Exhibit 81 is -- starts with the email  24 from Mr. Schroeder that we've identified dated March  25 22nd, 2001. It appears to have been forwarded by</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 215</p> <p>1 March 14th, 2001, to Roger Stern and Stuart Nichols,  2 with a copy to Bret DiMarco. And attached is an  3 edited version of Exhibit 77.</p> <p>4 Do you have any reason to doubt that you  5 were a recipient as shown in this string of emails?</p> <p>6 A. No.</p> <p>7 MR. BELNICK: By the way, I think the top  8 of 76, Shirl, answers the mystery of who Celina  9 Lopez is. She was the evening secretary apparently  10 at Wilson Sonsini.</p> <p>11 MS. WEISS: You are correct.</p> <p>12 BY MS. WEISS:</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. Exhibit 78 is an email from Stuart  14 Nichols dated March 22nd, 2001, to John Kispert, and  15 it forwards an email from Ken Schroeder dated March  16 22nd, 2001, to Stuart Nichols. Do you see that,  17 sir?</p> <p>18 A. Yes.</p> <p>19 Q. And did you forward Mr. Schroeder's  20 response to Mr. Kispert to -- I'm sorry --  21 Schroeder's response to you to Mr. Kispert?</p> <p>22 A. It appears I did.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. And it also says "per my voice  24 mail." And did you leave a voice mail with John  25 Kispert about the same subject matter?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 217</p> <p>1 yourself to Maureen Lamb on March 22nd, 2001, with  2 the attached message, "Let me know if you have any  3 thoughts on this." Is that correct?</p> <p>4 A. That's correct.</p> <p>5 Q. And you would have expected Miss Lamb to  6 read Mr. Schroeder's message; correct?</p> <p>7 A. Yes.</p> <p>8 Q. And then Exhibit 82 is an email chain that  9 starts with Mr. Schroeder's response to your email.  10 Mr. Schroeder's response os dated March 22nd, 2001.  11 You're forwarding Mr. Schroeder's email to Linda  12 Spitsen dated March 22nd, 2001. That's your wife,  13 is it?</p> <p>14 A. That's correct.</p> <p>15 Q. And her response of the same day to you,  16 and then your response to her message later on that  17 day.</p> <p>18 Do you have any reason to believe that --  19 to doubt that you were the sender and recipient as  20 shown on Exhibit 82?</p> <p>21 A. No. If I may, there is another document  22 attached to mine that you haven't authenticated  23 separately.</p> <p>24 MR. BELNICK: 2399.</p> <p>25 THE WITNESS: Yeah.</p>

55 (Pages 214 to 217)

Nichols, Stuart J. Esq.

1/27/2008

<p>1 MS. WEISS: Thank you.  2 MR. BELNICK: DiMarco to Stern on top of  3 one -- on top of Stu's.  4 BY MS. WEISS:  5 Q. Okay. And so the attachment to Exhibit 82  6 looks like the message of Mr. Schroeder dated March  7 22nd, 2001, which was forwarded to Mr. Stern and  8 Mr. DiMarco. There was a response by Bret DiMarco  9 dated March 22nd, 2001.  10 A. To Roger Stern. It didn't come to me.  11 Q. To Roger Stern that did not come to you.  12 All right. Very good.  13 MS. WEISS: Okay. Now, with respect to  14 all of those communications, Miss Heintz, is it the  15 company's position that it is instructing  16 Mr. Nichols not to respond to questions with respect  17 to all of these communications, Exhibits 68  18 through -- whatever that was -- 82 on the grounds of  19 the attorney-client privilege?  20 MS. HEINTZ: 69 through 82.  21 MS. WEISS: Yes.  22 MS. HEINTZ: 69 through 82. Yes. Not 68.  23 That's the one he was not copied on.  24 MR. BELNICK: That's Nyberg to Coffey.  25 MS. WEISS: Okay. And will it be the</p>	<p>Page 218</p> <p>1 signature didn't look like all the others of Stu  2 Nichols that you would bring it to our attention.  3 MS. WEISS: Well, I'm going to send them  4 to you.  5 MR. BELNICK: Oh, fine. Oh, sure.  6 MS. WEISS: I mean, I just don't want to  7 waste time doing it here.  8 MR. BELNICK: Oh, yeah, absolutely.  9 That's fine with me.  10 MS. WEISS: Then you can tell me if for  11 some reason they don't look like his signature.  12 MR. BELNICK: That's perfectly acceptable.  13 I appreciate that.  14 MS. WEISS: Is that okay with you as well?  15 MR. FICKES: That's agreeable with the  16 commission as well, yes.  17 MS. WEISS: 80?  18 DEPOSITION REPORTER: 84.  19 (Whereupon, Exhibit 84 was marked  20 for identification.)  21 MR. FICKES: Actually, Shirli, before you  22 move on, Elena brought up something that I think is  23 worthwhile. In regards to that stipulation, do we  24 want to do the same stipulation with the comp  25 committee meeting?</p>
<p>1 company's position that it will instruct all of the  2 senders and recipients that are shown on this  3 compilation of documents not to respond to my  4 questions about the contents?  5 MS. HEINTZ: Yes.  6 MS. WEISS: Okay.  7 While we're looking for another exhibit,  8 I'd like the company's and Mr. Nichols' stipulation  9 that all of the minutes -- that they will stipulate  10 to identifying all of the minutes that Mr. Nichols  11 appears to have signed rather than have him go  12 through each one.  13 MR. BELNICK: Sure.  14 MS. WEISS: Would that be acceptable to  15 the SEC and to the company and to --  16 MR. FICKES: I'm not sure I understand.  17 MR. BELNICK: I'm not sure what you mean.  18 I think it's probably acceptable, but I agree with  19 Mark. I don't know what you want us to stipulate  20 to. Is it an authentication stipulation?  21 MS. WEISS: Yes. That he prepared the  22 minutes and that he signed them and that he was  23 present at the meetings.  24 MR. BELNICK: From my point of view, yes,  25 with confidence that if you saw a minute where the</p>	<p>Page 219</p> <p>Page 221</p> <p>1 MS. WEISS: Yes. Good point. Good point.  2 Is that acceptable to you?  3 MR. FICKES: That's acceptable to us.  4 MS. WEISS: All right. We'll do a  5 compilation and send them to you.  6 MR. BELNICK: Acceptable to us as well.  7 MS. WEISS: Send them off to everybody,  8 and hopefully we'll just stipulate that they were  9 signed by Mr. Nichols.  10 BY MS. WEISS:  11 Q. Mr. Nichols, have you had an opportunity  12 to take a look at Exhibit 84?  13 A. Yes, I have.  14 Q. Can you identify Exhibit 84?  15 A. Yes. How would you like me to do that?  16 Q. Let me ask you. When is the first time  17 that you saw it?  18 A. Sometime in the period between June and  19 August of '06.  20 MR. BELNICK: Subsequent to the Wall  21 Street Journal article making allegations about  22 improper stock option activities at KLA; right?  23 THE WITNESS: Yeah. The Wall Street  24 Journal article was May 23rd of '06.  25 BY MS. WEISS:</p>

56 (Pages 218 to 221)

<p>1       Q. Were you conducting a search of the  2 company's records for documents related to the  3 company's internal investigation of its stock option  4 granting practices when you found this document?  5       A. When someone at my direction found the  6 document. Yes, that's correct.  7       Q. And that person brought it to you; is that  8 right?  9       A. That's right.  10      Q. And you turned the document over to  11 attorneys for the company?  12      A. Yes.  13      Q. And what is your --  14      A. Well, and the special committee.  15      Q. And what is your understanding as to where  16 the document is located?  17      A. My understanding of where the document was  18 located was on a server, a network server that  19 contained files left behind by my predecessor, Lisa  20 Berry.  21      Q. Okay. And who was the person who found  22 the document?  23      A. He is a contract attorney that I hired for  24 the purposes of assisting in the investigation  25 efforts whose name I'm blanking on at the moment.</p>	<p>Page 222</p> <p>1       wife, have you discussed the matters that we've  2 generally addressed here today, stock option,  3 granting practices of KLA, the investigation, the  4 SEC lawsuit, with anyone else?  5       A. No.  6       Q. There's no family -- there are no family  7 members that you've had discussions with other than  8 your wife?  9       A. Grant practices? No.  10      Q. Lawsuit?  11      A. The existence of this lawsuit?  12      Q. Yes.  13      A. Yes.  14      Q. Who have you discussed it with?  15      A. At a very high level I mentioned, for  16 example, to my team that I would be absent from work  17 preparing for it on Friday afternoon. I didn't  18 discuss the detail of it, just that I would be away  19 in connection with this.  20      Q. Okay. And when you were hired by MIPS,  21 did the subject of KLA Tencor's investigation and  22 possible fallout from that investigation in terms of  23 investigations and what have you, was that discussed  24 with MIPS?  25      A. Yes.</p>
<p>Page 223</p> <p>1       But if you give me a minute, it will probably come  2 to me.  3       Q. Okay. Do you remember the name of the  4 contract organization?  5       A. Yes. Hudson Legal.  6       Q. Hudson Legal?  7       A. Yes.  8       Q. Okay.  9       MS. WEISS: Are we going to be able to  10 enter into a stipulation as to the location of this  11 document in the company's records? Is that  12 something you want to --  13      MR. FICKES: Give us a second.  14      MS. WEISS: Why don't you think about  15 that? And that will be nice to save some time  16 there, too.  17      THE WITNESS: Predictably, the name of the  18 attorney has come to me. Andrew Middleton is his  19 name.  20      BY MS. WEISS:  21      Q. Andrew Middleton?  22      A. Andrew Middleton, M-i-d-d-l-e-t-o-n.  23      Q. Okay. Thank you.  24      Other than with the company's attorneys  25 with the SEC as we've established and with your</p>	<p>Page 225</p> <p>1       Q. And, in general, what was discussed with  2 them?  3       A. Actually, most of the discussion was  4 really not with me directly. I was -- had a working  5 relationship with a lawyer from Davis Polk named  6 Bill Kelly, who is a member of the board of  7 directors of MIPS. And it is my understanding that  8 my boss, MIPS's CEO, had discussions with Mr. Kelly  9 regarding my situation.  10      Q. Okay. But you did not have discussions at  11 MIPS about the situation?  12      A. I don't -- no, I don't believe so.  13      MS. WEISS: Okay. All right. Why don't  14 we take a few minutes. I'll look through my exhibit  15 list and see --  16      MR. FICKES: Can you tell me again what  17 the stipulation was that you wanted on Exhibit 84?  18 Because I might be able to get an answer to you.  19      MS. WEISS: Okay. So what I had in mind  20 is that we would stipulate that the document was  21 located on Lisa Berry's -- or on a server that  22 captured Lisa Berry's communications or work  23 product.  24      MR. BELNICK: A company server as opposed,  25 for example, to a laptop of Lisa --</p>

Nichols, Stuart J. Esq.

1/27/2008

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 226</p> <p>1 MS. WEISS: Well, that it's identified to    2 Lisa Berry, if you can --    3 MR. BELNICK: You have her initials in the    4 lower left.    5 MR. FICKES: That's fine with us. We can    6 stipulate to that.    7 MS. WEISS: Okay. So if you give me a few    8 minutes, I'll take a look at my exhibit list and see    9 what else we need to mark.    10 MR. BELNICK: I think you don't need to    11 mark anything else.    12 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Off the record. The    13 time is 4:24 p.m.    14 (Off the record.)    15 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the    16 record. The time is 4:38 p.m.    17 BY MS. WEISS:    18 Q. Mr. Nichols, I've asked you a number of    19 questions that I believe are germane to    20 Mr. Schroeder's defense in this lawsuit. And you    21 have been instructed not to respond to those    22 questions on the basis of privilege by counsel for    23 KLA Tencor, who holds the privilege. And,    24 therefore, I'm not going to proceed further at this    25 time. However, I'm going to leave the record open </p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 228</p> <p>1 to question the witness or to present the witness --    2 MR. BELNICK: That's correct. And I think    3 in fact Shirli mentioned that you may have questions    4 as well.    5 MR. FICKES: Okay.    6 MR. BELNICK: Certainly we're not going to    7 assert that objection on behalf of Mr. Nichols.    8 MS. WEISS: All right. We will adjourn    9 for today.    10 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Okay. One moment,    11 please. This is the end of videotape No. 3, volume    12 1, in the deposition of Stuart Nichols. The    13 original videotapes will be retained by LiveNote    14 World Service. Going off the record. The time is    15 4:40 p.m.    16 (Whereupon, the deposition adjourned.)    17 --oOo--    18    19    20    21    22    23    24    25 </p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 227</p> <p>1 in order to assess our options with respect to the    2 instruction -- your instruction not to respond.    3 And so we are going to be requesting    4 another day of your deposition. Also the    5 commission, I'm sure, will be asking you questions,    6 however that turns out. And I will coordinate with    7 your counsel --    8 MR. BELNICK: That's fine.    9 MS. WEISS: -- for another day of    10 deposition. I'll also send your counsel copies of    11 the minutes that I believe you signed so that we can    12 have a stipulation as to those issues.    13 MR. BELNICK: Also acceptable.    14 MS. WEISS: And I thank you very much for    15 coming today. I know you have other things to do,    16 and we appreciate it.    17 THE WITNESS: That you all for doing this    18 on a Sunday to accommodate my schedule.    19 MS. WEISS: Certainly.    20 MR. FICKES: And -- I'm sorry. Just while    21 we're still on the record, you probably said this.    22 I just want to make sure we're all on the same page,    23 because of the timing and because the record will    24 remain open, that no one here is going to assert an    25 objection that the commission has waived its right </p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 229</p> <p>1    2 DECLARATION    3 I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the    4 foregoing is my deposition under oath; that these are    5 the questions asked of me and my answers thereto; and    6 that I have read my deposition and have made the    7 corrections, additions, or changes to my answers that I    8 deem necessary.    9 In witness whereof, I hereby subscribe my name    10 this day of , 2007.    11    12    13    14    15 STUART NICHOLS    16    17    18    19    20    21    22    23    24    25 </p>

58 (Pages 226 to 229)

Nichols, Stuart J. Esq.

1/27/2008

Page 230

1 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER  
23 I, JANIS L. JENNINGS, a Certified Shorthand  
4 Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify:  
5 That the foregoing proceedings were taken  
6 before me at the time and place herein set forth; that  
7 any witnesses in the foregoing proceedings, prior to  
8 testifying, were placed under oath; that a verbatim  
9 record of the proceedings was made by me using machine  
10 shorthand which was thereafter transcribed under my  
11 direction; further, that the foregoing is an accurate  
12 transcription thereof.13 I further certify that I am neither  
14 financially interested in the action nor a relative or  
15 employee of any attorney of any of the parties.16 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have this date  
17 subscribed my name.18 Dated: January 29, 2008.  
19  
20  
2122 JANIS JENNINGS  
23 CSR NO. 3942  
24  
25